The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

194130

Identifying Strategies to Market Police in the News

Steve Chermak, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator
Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Affairs
Indiana University
Department of Criminal Justice
315 Sycamore Hall
Bloomington, IN 47405
812-855-5161
email: schermak@indiana.edu

Alexander Weiss, Ph.D.
Co-Principal Investigator
Northwestern University
Traffic Institute
405 Church Street
Evanston, IL 60208
847-491-5231
847-591-5270 FAX
alweiss@nwu.edu

FINAL REPORT

Approved By: _____

Date: _____

Identifying Strategies to Market the Police in the News

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study presents the results from a national survey of public information officers and media personnel in large sized cities. We examine police-media relations in two important areas. First, we investigate the day-to-day interactions of police public information officers and news personnel. We were interested in their evaluation of the quality of this relationship, their reliance on each other to accomplish organizational objectives, and their perceptions of the media's coverage of crime. Second, we identify the strategies used by law enforcement agencies to market community policing initiatives to the public. We discuss the strategies agencies use to promote community policing, whether these efforts are effective, and how media workers view community policing.

We have also analyzed a sample of newspaper articles about community policing to examine how it is presented in the news. We examine whether community policing is an important news topic. In addition, we identify the types of community policing programs presented to the public, whether community involvement is discussed in these articles, and what sources media workers rely on when presenting these stories to the public.

Key Findings

- Previous research has described the relationship between law enforcement and media organizations in many different ways, including "contentious," "symbiotic," and "parasitic." Situations certainly arise which strain police-media interactions. Media attention to a high profile incident involving several members of a department or a story criticizing a police organization will affect a department's willingness to cooperate, provide access, and divulge organizational information to the media. The survey research presented here, however, concludes that the relationship is typically quite accommodating, cooperative, and mutually supportive.

- PIOs appear to be the primary vehicle through which the department manages their public image. Almost all of the agencies surveyed relied primarily on public information staff to disseminate information about the department, and the PIOs have considerable access to the major media outlets within a city. Media personnel also discussed how they depend primarily on access to the law enforcement agency to construct crime stories.

- Law enforcement and media personnel have a positive view of this relationship. The public information officers were generally satisfied with the presentation of policing in the news. Similarly, media personnel were satisfied with the amount and types of information provided, although there were some differences in satisfaction when comparing results across medium (newspaper v. television) and across organizational position (reporter v. manager).

i

- Perhaps the most important factor influencing how the media viewed the quality of their relationship was accessibility to police data and police personnel. Media personnel indicated that the level of access to the police department determined their most effective relationships. When asked what made a relationship with a law enforcement agency adversarial, media personnel indicated that lack of access was the driving force.

- The burdens of responding to daily and frequent requests for crime incident information leaves very little time for public information officers to promote community policing initiatives. Most of the public information officer's time is spent providing information about specific crime incidents.

- Law enforcement agencies relegated the task of promoting community policing to different individuals in the department. Some agencies, for example, gave this responsibility to the public information officer. Others, however, have decentralized this function, relying on community policing staff to promote it. Finally, many departments coordinate public information and community policing staff to share the responsibility for promoting community policing.

- Although law enforcement agencies do not make significant efforts to promote community policing, news media are very accommodating when police request coverage for a community policing activity. However, media personnel indicated that law enforcement did a much better job in providing information about crime incidents than publicizing community policing.

- Despite this access, and the general opinion that police-media relations are good, this research also indicates that community policing is a low priority news topic. It is clear that media organizations have not been included as community policing partners, and police departments are not taking full advantage of their access to media organizations to promote community policing. It would seem to make sense for departments to use their access to reporters as an opportunity to generate publicity for these innovative strategies and encourage citizen cooperation. However, the efforts of law enforcement agencies to promote community policing have not translated into a significant amount of news coverage.

- Even when community policing is presented in the news, the coverage represents a limited view of this philosophy. There is very little discussion of the goals or history of community policing in these stories, and citizen involvement and cooperation is also not frequently mentioned. It would appear that the type of coverage that community policing gets in the news are efforts at public relations, but do not encourage the involvement of citizens in community policing.

- This research indicates that police departments are clearly missing an opportunity to promote community policing in the news. Indeed, community policing did not receive a significant amount of coverage even in areas where our survey results indicated that the police-media relationship was excellent. For example, we collected

data on the sources used in community policing stories and the police were provided primary attribution in these stories. News media also responded that it was their view that the public was interested in these types of stories. Although police are involved in the production of these stories, the image of community policing received by the public in the news is very limited. It is also clear that in order to generate the type of publicity that might inform citizens about community policing, and ultimately encourage involvement, police departments will have to take a much more systematic approach towards publicizing community policing in the news.

Implications and Issues

1. **Law enforcement agencies should implement and devise broad marketing strategies to increase public awareness and involvement in community policing activities.**

Our research results indicate that most law enforcement agencies only make minimal efforts to promote community policing in the news, and most of the coverage received is minimally descriptive. There are two important reasons for this limited publicity. First, public information officers do not have the time or the resources to promote community policing in the news. Second, news organizations are significantly more interested in covering specific crime incidents. It appears that the news media should be only one component of a strategy to promote community policing to citizens. Law enforcement agencies will have to incorporate other publicity strategies into an overall community policing marketing plan.

2. **Law enforcement agencies will need to increase the amount of personnel and monetary resources to more effectively market community policing in the news and in the community.**

Most of the efforts of public information officers are focused on responding to media requests for crime incident information. These requests occur frequently, and are from a variety of media outlets. Public information officers do not have enough time and resources to promote community policing in the news with any consistency. In addition, most of the agencies surveyed did not budget any money to promote community policing. Law enforcement agencies should consider using additional public information personnel, with the specific goal of promoting innovative programs, and provide funds to publicize these programs more effectively.

3. **Media and community policing training curriculum will have to be broadened to include a discussion of more effective ways to market community policing.**

Most media-training curriculum is very effective in terms of discussing various strategies to manage police-media interactions for crime incidents. However, media training will have to be broadened to increase awareness of how police agencies can use their access to news media by generating positive proactive strategies. In addition, it will be

iii

important to discuss how agencies can tap into community resources, like their business partnerships, to develop their efforts to publicize community policing. Finally, law enforcement personnel have to be informed of the various outlets to inform the public about community policing efforts.

4. **Research has to be conducted that can effectively evaluate whether implementing a broad marketing strategy is effective.**

One of the important community policing research issues that needs to be addressed is what can law enforcement agencies do to increase citizen awareness and involvement in community policing. The various media outlets available to law enforcement agencies are an area that needs exploration for accomplishing these goals. Research is available on the general effectiveness of newsletters and proactive crime-fighting publicity, but not much is known whether law enforcement agencies can use publicity to help accomplish community policing objectives. There is a need for research to examine innovative efforts to market the police in the news and determine the effectiveness of various publicity strategies.

INTRODUCTION

In this report we examine the efforts of law enforcement agencies to promote community policing in the news media. One of the significant issues facing the law enforcement community is developing and maintaining positive media relations. News organizations are especially interested in the beginning stages of the criminal justice process, emphasizing the crime occurrence, the police investigation, and the arrest of the suspect when presenting crime stories to the public (Chermak 1998). Media personnel rely primarily on law enforcement sources to produce these stories. This reliance puts incredible pressure on law enforcement agencies to decide what personnel will be responsible for interacting with media personnel, what types of information will be provided, and when information will be released. Media scrutiny is particularly intense when a critical event occurs, like a police shooting or a high profile crime incident. However, law enforcement agencies are not completely at the mercy of media personnel, and have developed strategies to manage this relationship (see Chermak 1995; Ericson, Baranek and Chan 1989). For example, police access to media personnel provides opportunities for law enforcement agencies to publicize new initiatives like community policing.

Community policing has emerged as an innovative and popular strategy to promote public safety, reduce fear of crime, and improve police-community relationships. An increasing number of police departments have implemented community- or problem-oriented strategies as a viable alternative to more traditional approaches (Wycoff 1994). A critical variable affecting the success of problem solving approaches is the involvement and support of citizens, although not much is known about

1

the efforts by police departments to market community policing. There is a need to increase public awareness and involve citizens in community policing. This points to the importance of including news organizations as partners in a comprehensive community policing plan.

Although the implementation of proactive and problem-solving police strategies requires the systematic flow of information to the public and the involvement of the news media, not much is known about what police departments are doing to publicize these efforts and the willingness of the media to provide such publicity. In this report, we examine the strategies police organizations use to market their innovative police programs to community leaders, the news media, and the public. Specifically, we examine the role public information officers have played in promoting law enforcement agencies generally and community policing specifically. We also examine whether news media are willing to disseminate community policing information in the news. We address several questions in this report related to the publicity of community policing:

*What are the responsibilities of police public information officers?

*How do public information officers view their relationship with the media?

*How do media personnel view their relationship with police agencies?

*Do newspaper and television personnel have similar views?

*Do media managers and media reporters have similar views?

*Who is responsible for promoting community policing?

*What strategies do agencies use to promote community policing?

*How effective are law enforcement agencies at publicizing community policing?

*How do media personnel view community policing?

2

*How is community policing presented in the news?

We address these questions in five sections. First, we briefly review some of the important literature in this area. Second, we discuss the research design. Third, we present the survey results of a national survey of public information officers and media personnel. Fourth, we present the results of a content analysis that examines how community policing is presented in the news. Finally, we discuss the policy implications of our findings and provide some suggestions for additional research.

MEDIA PUBLICITY AND COMMUNITY POLICING

One of the key elements to the success of community policing is greater citizen involvement and support (Greene & Mastrofski 1988; Mastrofski 1993; Trocjanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990). Community members have to know about these programs, have to be concerned about the problems being addressed, and have to be willing to give their time and participate. This support is particularly difficult to achieve in communities where police-community relationships have been strained because of high profile media incidents. In order to build the trust necessary to encourage participation, law enforcement agencies must systematically publicize their efforts to the public. What strategies are used to disseminate information about community policing? In what ways have the news media been integrated into their plans? How successful have these efforts been?

There is reason to suspect that such communication has not been an integral part of community policing implementation strategies. Results from a NIJ sponsored

3

evaluation of Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing (INOP) in eight jurisdictions point to limitations in the ability of law enforcement agencies to successfully market community policing strategies (Sadd and Grinc 1996). There were many important findings, but several concern the willingness of citizens to participate, and the ability of departments to communicate proactive policing programs. Among these findings were that: (1) citizen involvement was particularly challenging and participation was confined to a small group of individuals; (2) one of the main reasons citizens stated that they did not want to get involved was because of tensions between the police and certain groups; (3) community members did not understand their role; (4) police officers not involved in the INOP programs were unaware of the program goals; and perhaps most importantly, (5) police departments paid little attention to educating and including the community in the INOP programs examined.

In another study, Brian Williams (1998) examined citizen perspectives of community policing in Georgia. He concludes that most residents expressed a lack of direct knowledge or contact with community policing officers (p. 61), and most did not believe they were mutual partners in solving community problems (p. 66).

These findings point to three substantial obstacles to the implementation of community policing. First, law enforcement agencies may not be publicizing their efforts adequately or in a way that would help citizens to understand what they are trying to do. Second, even if they are publicizing their efforts, citizens may not be exposed to such publicity. Third, the relationship between the police and the public may be strained, and citizens may not believe a department is sincere in their efforts to offer a new approach to solving community problems.

4

The news media have the potential to be an important community policing partner, helping the police identify community problems and communicating the department's efforts to the public and community leaders. Understanding the news media's role in generating and publicizing these policing images is important for several reasons. First, the prevalence of the media provides the opportunity for a wide dissemination of information. Second, crime is a topic that has consistently been found to be a high priority news topic of significant public interest (Chermak 1995). Third, a large portion of the public does not have direct exposure to crime (Graber 1980), or participate in community policing programs (Sadd and Grinc 1996; Skogan 1989).

For example, the use of the media to promote citizen involvement in crime fighting "has emerged as a major component of criminal justice policy" (O'Keefe and Reid 1990: 209), and several evaluations of various types of publicity campaigns have been conducted (O'Keefe and Reid 1990; Pate et al. 1985; Rosenbaum et al. 1987; Sacco and Silverman 1984). O'Keefe and Reid (1990) examined public awareness and citizen attitudes after exposure to the "Take a Bite Out of Crime" advertising campaign. The results indicated that the campaign increased citizen awareness and improved attitudes toward crime prevention. An evaluation of neighborhood newsletters, however, did not produce promising results. Pate et al. (1985) circulated community newsletters in Newark and Houston as part of a strategy to reduce fear of crime. These newsletters contained crime prevention advice, neighborhood information, and some included local crime information. This type of publicity had no effect on citizen awareness, fear of crime, evaluation of police services, or satisfaction with the area.

Police departments have had other success entering into partnerships with the media to fulfill crime-fighting objectives. Consider the success and growth of "Crimestoppers" programs. These media segments are collaborative efforts involving the public, the police, and the media (Rosenbaum et al. 1987; Skolnick and McCoy 1985). Police departments have formalized the media's role in fighting crime by having them reenact unsolved crimes to generate additional leads and information. A NIJ funded evaluation of these programs illustrates the potential of police-media partnerships. This evaluation indicated that (1) the number of "Crimestoppers" programs grew dramatically (by 1985 there was 600 programs up from 48 only five years earlier), (2) the programs were highly visible and well received by media executives, (3) the programs were successful (these segments resulted in 92,000 thousand felony arrests, 20,000 convictions, and the recovery of over 500 million in stolen property), and (4) the programs increased citizen awareness of anti-crime efforts. In addition, this evaluation reported that programs having a more cooperative relationship with the media enjoyed greater success and productivity (Rosenbaum et al. 1987: 54).

Questions remain as to whether police departments have implemented innovative publicity strategies to communicate community policing programs to the public. Not much is known about what police departments are doing to disseminate information and encourage citizen participation, the success of the efforts, and the willingness of the news media to participate. An important first step in understanding this role is to identify the strategies used by police departments to publicize their efforts in the news and the willingness of news organizations to provide coverage.

6

RESEARCH DESIGN

The principal data gathering technique for this study was self-administered questionnaires mailed to police and media organizations. The focus of the law enforcement survey was on the strategies used to publicize innovative police efforts, and police-media relationships. Separate surveys were distributed to media managers and media reporters in television and newspaper organizations to examine how they view their relationship with the police, and whether they provide coverage to community policing. Finally, the information collected from these surveys was used to identify four police departments, two with positive and two with negative relationships with the news media. We then collected newspaper data in these four cities to examine how community policing is presented in the news.

A. *Law Enforcement Surveys*

The law enforcement survey was mailed to 239 law enforcement agencies located in cities with a population over 100,000. This sampling strategy was used for two reasons. First, this sample included the police departments most likely to have a public information office or employ full-time press officers (Skolnick and McCoy 1985). Second, the departments included in the sample were likely to have multiple daily contacts with various media. Although the organizations surveyed will not be completely representative of agencies located in smaller sized cities, the sample is likely to include organizations that have had to utilize innovative marketing strategies to get news coverage of community policing because of the large number of competing crime incident stories in these cities.

7

The focus of the questionnaire was on the strategies used to publicize innovative police efforts and police-media relationships. Specific areas of concern included: (1) the strategies used to market police departments in the news, (2) the personnel responsible for this marketing, (3) how receptive the news media have been to these strategies, (4) what can be done to increase effectiveness in these areas, and (5) general perceptions about the media's coverage of crime. The PIO survey is attached as an Appendix.

We sent the survey to the police chief, and asked him/her to forward the questionnaire to the person in charge of public information activities for the department. We received a completed survey from eighty-five percent of the agencies (203/239).

B. *Media Surveys*

The media questionnaires were administered to the major newspaper and two television organizations located in the same Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) as the law enforcement organizations. The newspaper with the largest circulation (cited in the *Editor and Publisher Yearbook*), and two television stations watched in the highest number of households (cited in the *Television and Cable Factbook*) were surveyed. Only the most popular and largest media organizations in each MSA were chosen for two reasons. First, we wanted to keep the number of media organizations manageable, but also increase the likelihood that at least one media organization responded in the cities surveyed. This allowed us to gauge perceptions of police-press relations from both sides of this relationship. Second, although several other types of media organization exist in every city (radio, other newspapers, and independent television organizations), the media surveyed are the organizations the public relies primarily on for news.

8

The research plan was to receive at least one survey response from television and newspaper personnel in every MSA where a police department was surveyed. The number of sampled media organizations (N=420) is higher than the number of police organizations (N=239) because we sampled both television and newspaper organizations. However, the number of sampled media organizations is not three times as high (1 newspaper, 2 television) because there may have been more than one law enforcement agency that fits the police sampling criteria in a media organization's marketing area (for example, Dallas media organizations would have relationships with at least three of the local police departments included in the sample--Dallas, Fort Worth, and Arlington).

The media surveys covered four specific areas: (1) the police sources relied on for crime information, (2) their perceptions of their relationship with the police, (3) the amount and type of coverage of community policing, and (4) what could be done to improve police-media relationships and increase coverage of community policing. Individuals were sampled from both managerial and line-level positions in order to be able to examine the police-media relationship from both perspectives.

1. Media Manager Survey. The media manager surveys are provided in Appendix B. The media sources cited above (the *Yearbook* and *Factbook*) were used to identify the managers' sample. The surveys sent to newspaper organizations were addressed to the city desk editor. This editor is responsible for supervising reporters covering local news, including police and court beat reporters. The media surveys sent to television organizations were addressed to the news director. The city editor and news director were chosen because of their supervisory position, because of their daily input

9

into the news product produced, and because of general understanding of the organization's relationship with the police department.

We sent surveys to 334 media managers and received 130 responses. Of the 179 surveys sent to newspaper managers, 72 were returned (40% response rate). We sent 155 surveys to television managers, and 58 were returned (38% response rate).

2. Reporter Survey. The reporter survey is provided in Appendix C. The names of television and newspaper reporters were determined by directly calling the media organizations. We used this procedure because we could not find a list of reporters from which a sample could be drawn. This was not surprising because there is typically considerable reporter turnover in the police beat.

We received 312 responses of the 635 surveys distributed. We sent 331 surveys to newspaper reporters, and received 161 responses (49% response rate). We sent a similar number of surveys to television organizations (304) and received a similar number of responses (151-a 50% response rate).

C. *Content Analysis*

The survey results were used to identify four law enforcement agencies with positive and negative (2 positive; 2 negative) relationships with the media (the selection procedure and the articles in the newspaper sample for these four cities is discussed in the section that discusses the content analysis results). We then collected community policing and crime articles from newspapers in these four cities using the Lexus-Nexus database. The lexis-nexus database provided us access to newspapers in a large number

10

of different cities. The content of these articles was analyzed, allowing us to provide a

discussion of the presentation of community policing programs in the news.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICERS

There have been a few studies examining the responsibilities of public

information officers (PIOs), providing us with a foundation for understanding the

importance of PIOs to the construction of a police department's image. Skolnick and

McCoy (1985), for example, examined police accountability by interviewing twenty-five

police chiefs and six journalists. Within a broader discussion of how police chiefs

attempt to manage a department's image using the news media, they discuss the

increasingly important role that PIOs have played in the dissemination of information on

crime incidents. They found PIOs to be specialists within the organization, and

illustrated how PIOs package information in a way that increases the likelihood that the

media covered the department in a positive way. These researchers admitted, however,

that a systematic sampling procedure should be used to examine these issues (p. 535).

Another study, by Ray Surette and Alfredo Richard (1995), described the public

information officer as gatekeeper to the police department. These researchers surveyed

PIOs in Florida to determine their specific attitudes, tasks, backgrounds, and training

requirements. In addition, they compared the public information activities of civilian and

sworn officers. Surette and Richard found that the responsibilities of PIOs included

responding to media inquiries, developing press releases, scheduling press conferences,

and conducting training. PIOs were described as "daily trouble shooters and first contact

points" between the police and the media (p. 329). An important finding of their work

11

concerns the involvement of PIOs in proactive image construction. These researchers discovered that much of what PIOs do is reactive, finding that they rarely prepackage information for news personnel (p. 329). Surette and Richard state: "On a daily basis, PIOs are organizational smoke detectors; in times of crises, they become fire extinguishers" (p. 329). When these officers were not reacting to crime incidents, police departments expected PIOs to do other activities other than proactive efforts to enhance a department's image.

Although the extant research examining the public information activities of police departments provides important information on how PIOs participate as official sources in the news production process, our research expands this understanding by providing a national snapshot of PIO activities, and looks more closely at their proactive publicity efforts. We discuss these findings below.

Characteristics of PIOs

The results from the public information officer survey indicate that PIOs play a very important role in managing an agency's public image. Eighty percent of the departments surveyed had at least one full-time official responsible for disseminating public information and interacting with the media. Moreover, even in departments that did not have an officer officially designated as a public information specialist, they assigned personnel to perform this role. Police chiefs, members of the command staff, or mayoral spokespersons performed public information duties for agencies without a designated PIO.

Most agencies assigned public information tasks to a small number of individuals. On average, departments used less than two sworn or non-sworn members to fulfill public information responsibilities. The mean number of sworn PIO staff was 1.96, ranging from as few as 0 to as many as 52 sworn personnel in a law enforcement agency. The mean number of non-sworn staff was about 1.84, ranging from 0 to 86 public information personnel.[1] The majority of the departments used an officer in a supervisory position. Approximately 5 percent of the PIOs were Police Chiefs, 4.6 percent were Assistants to the Chief, 6.7 percent were Captains, 24.1 percent were Lieutenants, and 23.6 percent were Sergeants. Approximately 20 percent of the PIOs were patrol officers or detectives, and just over 10 percent were civilians. The PIOs had an average of 4.3 years of public information experience, and had at least 50 hours of formal training in police-media relations. However, fifty-six percent of the respondents said this amount of training was inadequate.

The survey results also indicate that the PIOs work closely with the chief. Sixty percent of the PIOs meet with the chief executive of the department every day or several times a day, and an additional thirty percent met at least once a week. Ninety-five percent of the PIOs surveyed agreed that their activities are very important to the construction of the department's image.

The network of outside contacts relied upon by PIOs appears to be confined to their local area. PIOs rarely contacted public information officers from other law enforcement agencies. Over half of the PIOs in the survey never contacted other police PIOs or did so less than once a month. They did rely on public information officers from

---

[1] We assumed that 52 and 86 were valid, although the range for sworn in all other departments was 0 to 9 and the range for nonsworn was 0 to 7. The sworn mean without these cases is 1.6; the nonsworn mean is 1.

other agencies, such as the Mayor's office. Approximately forty-seven percent of the PIOs contacted other public relations personnel from other government offices daily or weekly. In addition, nearly sixty percent of the PIOs said that they meet with business and community leaders on a weekly or daily basis.

Frequency of Media Contacts

Public information officers have many opportunities to shape public understanding of the police through their frequent interactions with media personnel. The PIOs surveyed are very active, and are contacted by sixteen different reporters in a typical week. In addition, PIOs have contact with reporters representing a range of media, interacting with reporters from about four newspapers, five television organizations, and four radio stations at least once a week. However, the PIOs rarely had contact with media managers. Eighty-five percent of the PIOs did not meet with media managers or only met with them once a month.

Data from the media surveys also support the conclusion that law enforcement and media personnel interact frequently. The managers and reporters said that over seventy-three percent of the information on crime incidents was provided by law enforcement sources. We also asked media personnel to identify who was their most important source for information on law enforcement. Figure 1 presents these results. Over forty percent of the media respondents said individual law enforcement officers were their most important source of information. The second most frequently cited source was public information officers. Over thirty-five percent of the media respondents said that PIOs were the most important source of law enforcement information. When

14

we asked media personnel to explain why this was the most important source, nearly half of the respondents said the quality and the amount of information this source can provide. Similarly, the second most important factor was their availability. Figure 1 also indicates that about eight percent of media respondents said either the police chief, some other law enforcement executive, or some other source was their most important source.

Table 1 presents results on the accessibility of the chief and the PIO. We present these results for television managers, television reporters, newspaper managers, and newspaper reporters. In general, media personnel were satisfied with their accessibility to the chief and to the PIO. Approximately eighty percent of the media personnel thought the chief was very or somewhat accessible and over ninety-three percent said that PIOs were very or somewhat accessible. Managers and reporters were similarly satisfied with their level of access to the chief and the PIO, although reporters from both mediums were more likely to indicate that the chief and the PIO were very accessible. The results from the different mediums are also similar. However, newspaper managers were less likely to indicate that the PIO was very accessible when compared to television managers.

The reporters were much more likely to interact with the chief than were the media managers. Figure 2 presents these results. Over eight percent of the reporters said they interacted with the chief every day, and nearly twenty percent said they interacted with the chief at least once a week. None of the managers said that they met daily with the chief, and only six percent said that they met with the chief weekly. Over twenty-eight percent of the manager respondents met with the chief only once a year and over eight percent had never met the chief. Approximately four percent of the reporters never interacted with the chief and just over seven percent met only once a year with the chief.

15

Impressions of Media Coverage

The PIOs had very positive views about citizen perceptions of the police and their relationship with the news media. Eighty-eight percent of the PIOs thought that citizens have a favorable opinion of the department, and the PIOs did think strongly that media coverage in their area affects community perceptions of the police. The PIOs also thought that media attention to a high profile incident in another community adversely affected their public image. The PIOs did not feel strongly about the amount of attention the media provides to crime. Only forty-one percent of the PIOs agreed with the statement that the media gives too much attention to crime, although fifty percent of the PIOs thought the reporters are more interested in the problems of the department rather than its accomplishments.

Similarly, over eighty percent of the media personnel surveyed said that most citizens have a favorable opinion of local law enforcement agencies, and over eighty percent said that citizens are interested in news about local law enforcement agencies. Approximately fifty-five percent said that the image of law enforcement portrayed in the local media is positive.

THE POLICE-MEDIA RELATIONSHIP

Evaluating the Quality of Police-Media Relationships

The survey results indicate that both sides of the police-media transaction have a very positive view of the relationship (see Figure 3). For example, nearly ninety percent of the PIOs either agreed or strongly agreed that the current status of their relationship with most news organizations is good. Similarly, seventy-two percent of the combined

16

media sample (television/newspaper managers/reporters) agreed or strongly agreed that the relationship was good. These findings support previous research--relying primarily on ethnographic methods--that characterizes the police-media relationship as symbiotic (Chermak 1995; Chibnall 1977; Fishman 1980; Grabosky and Wilson 1989; Hall et. al 1978).

There was, however, some variation in satisfaction when we compared the results across medium. Over eighty percent of the combined (manager/reporter) television sample agreed or strongly agreed that the relationship was good. On the other hand, only sixty-three percent of newspaper personnel agreed or strongly agreed that the relationship was good. These differences in satisfaction can be attributed to the newspaper managers who were significantly less satisfied with their relationship with the police compared to any other group of media personnel. Only forty-four percent of the newspaper managers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that their relationship was good. The newspaper managers who disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement were primarily concerned with a perceived lack of access to the police department and the willingness of the department to provide information.

As we expected, the reporters rated the quality of the relationship higher than the managers did. Seventy-eight percent of the reporters agreed or strongly agreed that the relationship with law enforcement was good. Approximately sixty-seven percent of the managers agreed or strongly agreed that their relationship with law enforcement was good. We think that this reflects differences in the types of interaction that different levels of the news organization have with law enforcement. Reporters interact with the police, and more specifically the public information officer, on a daily basis. Thus, their

rating of the quality of the relationship reflects their hands-on evaluation of the quality of the relationship. Managers interact with the public information officer less frequently thus their evaluation is based more on their perceptions of the relationship. Their perceptions might be influenced by a number of factors, including what they believe to be the quality of daily interaction.

Although law enforcement and media personnel described their interactions in a positive way, both had suggestions for improvement. For example, we asked an open-ended question about what could be done to improve the quality of the police-media relationship. Approximately 175 of the 203 PIOs had suggestions. The most frequently cited suggestion was for the media to develop a better understanding of the department's goals. Almost twenty percent of the PIOs suggested that the media should have a better understanding of what the police are trying to accomplish in their community. Eighteen percent of the PIOs said they should meet more frequently with media personnel. Nearly thirteen percent criticized the media, and said the media has to be less sensationalistic in order for the relationship to improve. Other suggestions for improvement included training (10.7%), budgetary increases (6.1%), better communication (8.1%), improve policy (2.5%) and three percent of the responses were classified as "other responses." Interestingly, over eighteen percent of the PIOs said that nothing should be done to improve the quality of the relationship.

The media respondents indicated that they interacted with a large number of different police organizations. For example, when we asked the media personnel how many law enforcement agencies were in their local coverage area, the response mean was 37.4, responses ranging from 3 to 600. It is also apparent that the quality of the

18

relationship between the news media and different law enforcement agencies varies. Over ninety percent of the media respondents said that their relationship with some departments was better than with others. We also asked an open-ended question asking for three factors that make some relationships better. Table 2 presents these results. The primary reason cited which affects the quality of the relationship was accessibility. The more access to information and the more available the PIO was, the better the relationship. Other important issues included the professionalism or attitudes of the officers they interacted with, the history of the relationship, and the level of respect or trust between the police and the media.

The media surveys produced similar results when we asked whether some of their interactions with the media are adversarial. Table 2 also presents these results. Nearly seventy-five percent of the respondents said that some of their relationships with the police are more adversarial than others. It appears that one of the primary concerns media have was with access and accessibility to information. In addition, a large number of the media respondents thought that lack of honesty and professionalism made their relationship more adversarial.

PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICERS AND COMMUNITY POLICING

When Police-Media Interact

The majority of PIO activity focused on responding to media requests for crime incident information. Figure 4 presents these results. The PIOs stated that about forty-four percent of their time was spent providing information about crime incidents. They also stated that about fifteen percent of their time was spent on requests for information

19

on police initiatives like community policing programs. The rest of their time was spent providing various types of information, including information on police misconduct, organizational policy, and other activities like award ceremonies.

These estimates of the amount of time PIOs spend on various activities were similar to the media estimates of the percentage of news space devoted to each of the topic areas. Figure 5 presents these results. The media respondents thought that about sixty-two percent of news space was devoted to crime incident stories. Similar to the PIO estimates, media personnel said that about fifteen percent of news space was devoted to police initiatives, nine percent of news space was devoted to police misconduct, and eight percent described other types of stories. There was little variation in these percentages across medium or across organizational position.

The infrequent coverage of police initiatives occurs for two reasons. First, public information officers are overwhelmed by requests for information on crime incidents. These requests leave little time for the promotion of proactive programs. Second, this infrequent coverage is reflective of differences in the ability of the media to produce these stories compared to writing a story about a crime event. Reporters are able to produce several crime incident stories a day by relying on the information in police incident reports. However, it would take much more time and effort to produce a community policing story because the information is not as accessible and the number of sources that should have to be contacted is much broader.

News personnel did however think that the public was interested in community policing stories. Seventy percent of the news personnel agreed or strongly agreed that the public was interested in community policing, and the media managers thought that the

public was more interested compared to the reporters. Seventy-six percent of the managers agreed or strongly agreed that the public was interested in community policing, and sixty-seven percent of the reporters agreed or strongly agreed that they were interested.

Efforts to Publicize Community Policing

Ninety six percent of the agencies in the sample had some type of community policing program. Public information officers publicized these activities, and had very strong opinions about the importance of community policing to law enforcement. The PIOs stressed that good relationships with the news media are an important component of a community policing program. Eighty-three percent of the PIOs agreed with the statement that community policing has been an asset to the department. Less than half of the PIOs strongly agreed or agreed that community policing had actually increased the contact the police had with the media. This finding probably reflects the fact that police-media contact was likely to be very high prior to the implementation of community policing in an agency.

Although eighty percent of the PIOs thought that their department did a good job publicizing positive aspects of the agency, the results also indicate that departments use different strategies to promote community policing. For example, departments use different personnel to publicize these activities. Approximately half of the PIO respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed that public information duties have been decentralized as part of their community policing program. About twenty-seven percent of the PIOs strongly agreed or agreed that community policing publicity duties have been

decentralized. Community policing or crime prevention units were the units most frequently cited as being responsible for publicizing community policing efforts when the publicity function was decentralized. The command staff was also cited as playing an important role in publicizing these programs. Twenty percent of the respondents did not agree or disagree with this statement, perhaps reflecting that these departments share publicity responsibilities between public information and community policing staff. The PIO staff in this last group of departments had frequent contact with community policing units. For example, half of the PIOs had daily contact, and an additional twenty-five percent had weekly contact.

We compared the responses to the question, "Our department does a good job publicizing positive aspects of our agency," in departments where community policing publicity was decentralized to those where it was not and to where PIOs neither agreed or disagreed that this publicity function was decentralized. Not surprisingly, ninety percent of the PIOs in agencies that did not decentralize community policing strongly agreed or agreed that they did a good job. In contrast, sixty-seven percent of the PIOs in agencies that are decentralized strongly agreed or agreed that they did a good job publicizing community policing, and about seventy percent of those PIOs that neither agreed or disagreed that the publicity function was decentralized strongly agreed or agreed that they did a good job.

Nearly eighty percent of the PIOs thought that the local media are accommodating when requesting publicity for a new community policing activity. When asked what percentage of the time the PIO was able to garner publicity for a community policing program, they thought that they were successful sixty-seven percent of the time. PIOs

used various methods to publicize innovative police programs. Figure 6 presents these results. Most of the PIOs cited several methods, but the two strategies most frequently used were press releases and communicating directly with the news media. By using their established access to news personnel, PIOs stressed that these methods were the easiest and most efficient ways to maximize coverage for a particular community policing program. These methods allowed PIOs to reach several types of media outlet, as well as incorporate a large amount of information. In addition, they discussed how the media were most responsive to their requests when they provided information to them using one of these two methods. Organizing news conferences were significantly less likely to be used as a publicity strategy because they are more time-consuming than using other methods.

Television and newspaper news were similarly preferred for the publication of community policing initiatives. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents preferred either television or newspaper news. Television news was preferred by some of the respondents because of the ability to reach a large audience. Others preferred newspapers because they could include more information within a story. One of the PIOs stated that he "doesn't think there is a "better way" between newspapers and television. Both have advantages and disadvantages, including length of time/space given to a story, and the target audience." Only two percent of the respondents would recommend publicizing community policing initiatives using radio news, although they thought radio talk shows were an important resource.

One obstacle to publicizing community policing activities cited by the PIOs was money. Only eleven percent of the departments had a budget to assist in the publication

of innovative programs. Although the amount of money ranged from 500 to 200,000 dollars, most agencies had a small amount.

Ninety-three percent of media personnel said they were very familiar or familiar with the community policing activities in their jurisdiction. Similar to the views of the PIOs, the media respondents did not think that community policing improved the relationship between the police and the media. Only twenty-three percent of media respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that their relationship has improved since the introduction of community policing.

Although the media respondents said that the public was interested in local community policing activities, they were generally critical of the efforts of the police department to keep them informed about community policing. Only about forty percent of the media personnel agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that the police do a good job of keeping them informed about community policing. These results were similar by medium and by organizational position. There were however some minor differences in the responses from media personnel when examining whether departments had decentralized the community policing publicity responsibility. Over forty-six percent of the media personnel strongly agreed or agreed that police do a good job publicizing community policing when this responsibility was not decentralized; thirty-nine percent of media personnel strongly agreed or agreed when this responsibility was decentralized; and nearly fifty-two percent of the media personnel said that police do a good job of publicizing community policing when the PIO neither agreed or disagreed that the community policing publicity responsibility was decentralized.

We also asked media respondents to identify who was their most important source of information on community policing activities. Figure 7 present these results. When reporters decide to cover a community policing program, the primary promoter of the story from the police department is the public information officer. Nearly fifty percent of the media personnel said that the person responsible for keeping them informed about community policing was the public information officer. Individual police officers, a category that was cited most frequently as the most important source of crime incident information (see Figure 1), was the second most frequently cited category. About twenty percent of the media respondents said that individual officers were most likely to keep them informed on community policing activities. Police chiefs, other law enforcement executives, and the other category were cited in that order as being an important source of information on community policing.

Over eighty-five percent of the reporters said that they had published a story on local community policing activities in the past twelve months. We also asked how frequently they published community policing stories in the past twelve months. The results indicate that 20.5 percent of the reporters had done 1 to 2 stories, 28.6 percent had published 3 to 4 stories, 25.1 percent had published 5 to 7 stories, 12.7 percent had published one 8 to 10 stories, and 13.1 percent had published 11 stories or more. We asked a similar question of the managers to get a sense of the overall importance of community policing as a news topic. These results indicate that 1.6 percent of the managers said that local community policing stories appear daily, 15.4 percent said they appear weekly, 46.3 percent said they appear monthly, 23.6 percent said they appear about twice a year, and 13 percent reported some other amount.

The media respondents said that local law enforcement agencies were able to get coverage of innovative police programs when they sought such coverage about seventy-six percent of the time. We also asked the media respondents to discuss the best way for law enforcement officials to keep them informed about community policing to increase the likelihood of coverage. The vast majority of respondents (67.4%) said that the best way to increase coverage was to have the PIO contact media personnel directly. Only about eleven percent thought that press conferences and about eight percent thought press releases were the best way to generate community policing publicity. Approximately fifteen percent suggested other ways to generate publicity. The most frequent other suggestion included demonstrating effective community policing results and informing reporters about a specific event that would be of interest to the public.

OTHER EFFORTS TO PUBLICIZE COMMUNITY POLICING

We also asked about other community policing related responsibilities of the PIOs. A large number of the PIOs said that they were responsible for either attending community meetings, writing and distributing newsletters, working with neighborhood groups, operating student or citizen police academies, or conducting citizen seminars. Moreover, PIOs support community policing programs by contacting community and business leaders to discuss programs.

The departments also used various electronic strategies to promote community policing efforts. For example, fifteen percent of the PIOs made frequent appearances on television shows or radio talk shows to promote the department's community policing

26

programs. Several departments also had cable television shows to discuss community policing activities or used web sites to promote these activities.

COMMUNITY POLICING IN THE NEWS

The survey results were used to identify two law enforcement agencies with positive and two agencies with negative relationships with the media. The two agencies where it appeared the police had a very positive relationship with news media were the Chicago Police Department and the San Diego Police Department. The two agencies where there was considerable dissatisfaction with their relationship were the Tulsa Police Department and the Hollywood (Florida) Police Department. We then examined how community policing was presented in a local newspaper in these areas. The four newspapers used in the content analysis were *The San Diego-Union Tribune*, *The Chicago Tribune*, *The Tulsa World*, and *The Sun Sentinel*. Our content analysis was focused on newspaper content for two reasons. First, it was difficult to get access to a sample of television news stories from these four cities. Second, research comparing television to newspaper coverage consistently indicates that policy stories are rarely presented on television (Chermak 1995). Most television stories are short and focus on specific crime-incidents.

We used a four-step process to determine which agencies had positive or negative police-media relations. First, we used the PIO data to determine the departments that appeared to have an excellent or poor relationship with the news media. We used the responses to four survey questions, all likert items with responses from strongly disagree

to strongly agree, to determine this pool of departments: (1). Our relationship with local news media is good; (2). Our police department does a good job publicizing the positive aspects of the agency; (3). Good relationships between the news media and our agency are an important component of community policing; and (4). When publicizing community policing, local media are accommodating. The highest possible score a department could receive when the total for these four questions was calculated was 20 (up to 5 points per item (1 strongly disagree-5 strongly agree) X 4 items). The total score on these four items for San Diego and Chicago was 19, and the total for Hollywood was 10 and for Tulsa it was 8. The mean total for the other departments in the sample was 17.

Second, we then examined the survey results from the media managers and media reporters in the market areas of these departments to assess how the media evaluated this relationship. The three media questions that we used to identify media reaction to police media activities were: (1). Our relationship with local police departments is good; (2). The police do a good job of keeping us informed about innovative programs; (3). The public information officer is very accessible. In each market area surrounding a law enforcement agency, there were a different number of newspaper and television personnel responding to our survey. In San Diego, for example, six different media personnel responded, and in Chicago only three reporters responded. Thus, we calculated an average score for each question and then totaled the three averages. Out of a possible score of 15, the San Diego media responses totaled 12.5, the Chicago total was 12.2, the Tulsa total was 7 and the Hollywood total was 9.5. The mean total for media personnel from all other market areas was 11.[2]

---

[2] It is important to note that the media responses do not necessarily reflect an evaluation of specific law enforcement agencies. As noted earlier, media personnel have relationships with a large number of

Third, we then used other survey results to limit the pool of cities as much as possible. For example, we asked all PIOs to identify three other departments that were particularly strong at working with the news media. There was a broad range of responses to this question, but the two departments we rated as outstanding were among the most frequently mentioned places known for strong media relations. We also asked about the amount of resources devoted to public information, the degree of access to the organization's chief executive, and the quality of the relationship between public information activities and community policing officers.

Finally, the last criteria we used to choose cities was data accessibility. The newspaper had to be available through the Lexis-Nexus database for ease in data collection.

After we selected the market areas and newspapers of interest, we collected two samples of articles. The first sample was a collection of *all* news stories on community policing published between Jan 1, 1997 and December 31, 1997. We used the following keyword search strategies to identify these stories: community policing; problem oriented policing; community police; problem solving policing; community oriented policing; neighborhood and policing; neighborhood policing; and community and police. Although this last search strategy produced a list of articles that included a large number of irrelevant articles, we used it to ensure that we did not overlook any community policing stories. We included any articles written by staff of that paper that focused on community policing in that market area, and included citizen op-ed pieces and editorials in the sample as well.

---

departments. Thus, their responses to these questions may or may not reflect positive and/or negative evaluations with the departments we are concerned with here.

The second sample was of crime incident stories published in 1997. We collected this sample to estimate the importance of community policing stories relative to crime stories. We collected all crime stories published (the search strategy was crime or police) in each paper during two randomly-constructed weeks. Prior research indicates that constructed samples are representative of newspaper coverage for one year (Riffe, Aust, and Lacy 1993). The dates we included were: 2/15/97; 2/18/97; 2/26/97; 3/8/97; 4/24/97; 5/1/97; 5/2/97; 5/21/97; 8/12/97; 9/21/97; 10/6/97; 12/1/97; 12/19/97; and 12/28/97. Our focus here was on the beginning stages of the criminal justice system (discovery, arrest, investigation, and arraignment); stories about police activities and the department; and stories about general trends in crime. Also, the story had to be written by a staff reporter, or had to be an editorial or a citizen op-ed piece.

We used three graduate students for coding. After each student coded a subsample of articles, we met to discuss discrepancies and clarified the coding rules. We then assigned two graduate students to a specific newspaper and a third student to code two different newspapers. We also had each student code a random sample of articles in the other newspapers to assess reliability. Inter-coder reliability for the community policing article sample was eighty-two percent. Inter-coder reliability for the crime article sample was ninety percent.

The Presentation of Community Policing in the News

Table 3 presents the total number of stories and mean number of words in each newspaper for the crime incident and community policing samples. We examined 1,273 stories. As all previous research would predict and our survey results support, the focus

of each newspaper was on crime incidents. We examined 829 crime incident stories, and 447 community policing stories. In each market area, the total number of crime stories for the 2-week constructed sample was significantly more than the total number of community policing stories for the *entire* year. Crime stories are significantly easier to produce than stories evaluating community policing programs. A reporter, for example, could simply rely on several police reports and contacts with police sources, enabling him/her to produce two to four crime incident stories in a day. However, the production of a news story examining a community policing program would require substantially more effort, perhaps including contacts with community policing officers, residents, community leaders, and examining the specific successes of a program.

Although community policing stories are less frequently presented, when provided coverage they are given more space than crime incident stories. The average size of a crime incident story was approximately 193 words. In contrast, community policing stories averaged about 519 words. This result again reflects the effort that typically must be used to produce the different type of story and the number of contacts with sources that will be included.

Table 3 also helps illustrate how infrequently individual law enforcement agencies generated publicity for community policing programs. For each community policing story, we collected data on the specific police department examined in a story. Column three of Table 3 presents the number of stories and mean number of words for the Chicago Police Department, the San Diego Police Department, the Tulsa Police Department, and the Hollywood Police Department (recall that Chicago and San Diego were used as examples of positive relationships and Tulsa and Hollywood were examples

of negative). Only 36 community policing stories were presented about the Chicago Police Department, 39 stories about the San Diego Police Department, 17 stories about the Tulsa Police Department, and 24 stories about the Hollywood Police Department in 1997. Although there are some differences in the frequency of coverage, none of the departments received significant amount of community policing coverage.

Table 4 includes the content results for the type of community policing story presented. We also present the results for the four market areas of the study (All Column) and the individual departments of interest (Main Column). This table indicates that approximately forty percent of this sample discussed community policing as part of a department's overall police strategy. An example of this type of story is how the media reported the response to a series of shootings in a specific neighborhood. After discussing the shootings, the article described how the police were increasing patrols in that area and increasing the involvement of community policing officers. Table 4 also indicates that about twenty-one percent of all community policing stories discussed a specific police program, like bike patrol, citizen police academies, and community action teams. These stories discuss the implementation or the operation of a community policing program, and the focus is on the implementation or operation efforts of the police department. Another type of program story presented, although covered much less frequently, were citizen or community programs. Approximately seventeen percent of the sample focused on a citizen or community-initiated program that was linked to a police department's community policing efforts. Many stories were coded as "Other." Most of these stories focused on a specific community police event (e.g., March against

32

Drugs, community barbecue). Fewer stories were presented that evaluated community policing or examined the efforts and activities of specific community police officers.

Table 4 also presents the results by market area and individual department. The presentation of the individual departments did not differ significantly when compared to the market area presentation. The one exception is that stories about the Chicago police department focused on the evaluation of community policing or a specific community event, whereas the types of story presented about the rest of the departments in that market area were more evenly distributed across the various categories.

In addition, there are not any clear patterns from the results of departments with positive relationships compared to departments with negative relationships. Over half of the stories in Hollywood and San Diego discussed community policing as part of an overall police strategy. Community policing stories in Chicago were less likely to describe community policing as an overall police strategy, but were more likely to present evaluation results. In Tulsa, however, nearly half of the stories were community-focused.

We examined what aspects of community policing are presented in the news. We were interested in whether stories discussed community policing goals, the philosophy of community policing, the history of community policing in the department, interactions between the department and politics, and also whether community policing was presented favorably. Table 5 presents these results. An overwhelming majority of community policing stories in all newspapers were favorable. Over seventy-four percent of the entire community policing story sample was favorable. These results were fairly consistent across the four market areas. Community police articles about the Chicago Police

Department, which our results indicated had a positive relationship with the media, was the only place that received some negative coverage of their community policing efforts. However, for the entire Chicago police department sample, only 3.3 percent of the stories were not favorable.

Most of the stories presented about community policing in all the cities present it as an independent occurrence not linked to its history, philosophy, or goals. Eighty-five percent of the stories did not discuss the philosophy of community policing, and over ninety-seven percent of the stories did not provide any historical context. These results are consistent across the four samples. The goals of community policing were mentioned more frequently, but still only in about sixty-five percent of all community policing stories. Moreover, the goals of community policing were more frequently included in community policing stories in Tulsa and Hollywood compared to Chicago and San Diego. These results perhaps reflect a major concern with how the media cover most crime and policing issues. Even when an issue or criminal justice program is covered, news media provide only limited context about that issue.

We also wanted to look closely to see whether the media provided any coverage of the involvement of the citizens in community policing programs. Such involvement is crucial to the success of community policing. Table 6 presents these results. Citizen involvement was only mentioned in less than half of the stories, and in just over thirty percent of the stories is it discussed how citizens could participate in community policing. For example, in only thirty-one percent of the stories is it discussed how citizens could participate in community policing. Only fourteen percent of the Chicago police department sample discussed how citizens could participate. In contrast, nearly half of

the Hollywood articles discussed how citizens could participate. In addition, the number of community groups mentioned in a community policing story is small. On average, fewer than two community groups are mentioned.

When interactions are discussed, however, they are typically presented in a positive way. Over eighty percent of the stories discussed favorable interactions between police and citizens. The community police stories presented about Chicago were much more likely to discuss police citizen interaction as being not favorable. Most of the negative coverage of the Chicago police department was from concern of the quality of interaction between police and citizens in Chicago. These negative stories were not necessarily indictments of community policing, but were more likely to be directed at the Chicago Police Department more generally. For example, several of the stories discussed brutality cases. Community policing is mentioned in these stories, sometimes as part of the problem but also sometimes as a solution.

We also examined whether various outcomes were identified in community policing stories. Table 7 presents these results. Among the many goals of community policing are the reduction of crime, the reduction of fear of crime, and the improvement of the quality of fear. However, these outcomes are rarely mentioned in any news stories about community policing. For example, the fear of crime was mentioned in only nine percent of the stories, the quality of life was mentioned in only seventeen percent, and efforts to reduce crime was only mentioned in forty percent of the stories. Quality of life and fear of crime were mentioned in a similar percentage of the stories about the individual departments we examined. However, the goal of reducing crime was mentioned in less than fourteen percent of the Chicago police department sample, and

less than thirty-six percent of the San Diego police department sample. The reduction of crime was mentioned in nearly half of the Tulsa police department sample, and over forty percent of the Hollywood sample.

The final area we wanted to examine was the sources that were provided attribution in the community policing stories. We collected data on the first three police sources cited, and the first three other sources. Most stories contained only a couple of references to sources, and we thought that the sources cited near the beginning of the story provided a proxy for the importance of a source. The mean number of other sources cited in community policing articles was 1.8 and the number of police sources was 1.1. These differences can be attributed to the broader range of other sources cited compared to the police. For example, the range of other sources was 0 to 15, and the police source range was 0 to 7.

Table 8 presents the specific sources cited in community policing stories. The chief and the command staff account for other fifty percent of the first three sources cited. The number of PIOs provided attribution is small, but this reflects that PIOs were rarely specifically identified as such in a story. The PIOs, however, probably account for a large percentage of the command staff attributions.

Table 8 also indicates that citizens and community representatives account for a disproportionate number of other source attributions. For example, nearly seventy percent of the first sources cited was either a citizen or community representative. Politicians accounted for almost sixteen percent of the attributions to an other source.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

We believe that this research significantly increases our understanding of the relationship between law enforcement and media organizations, the strategies used by police agencies to generate publicity for community policing, and the success of these efforts. Our results also highlight several important policy issues.

First, we believe that law enforcement agencies should consider devising and implementing broader marketing strategies to increase public awareness and involvement in community policing activities. Public information officers should play an important role in the development of this broad strategy, but will need to work closely with the chief, command staff, and community policing personnel to develop it. This marketing strategy would of course include the news media as a prominent community policing partner. However, it is obvious that the news media does not have the space or the interest to make community policing a high priority news topic. Police departments should flood the public with as much information as possible from various media sources from as many individuals in the agency as possible. More importantly, it will probably be easier to publicize community policing programs using other avenues outside the news media.

The survey research presented examining the day-to-day operations of police-media relations concludes that the relationship is typically quite accommodating, cooperative, and mutually supportive. Our results make it clear that public information officers play a critical role in constructing the *images of crime* presented in the news. Police departments generally, and public information officers specifically, are an important source of crime information for news personnel. Public information officers

37

have daily contact with reporters from a variety of media outlets. PIOs appear to be the primary vehicle through which the department manages their public image. One would expect that the image provided by them would be consistent with the agency's goals. PIOs are well trained in media relations, contact reporters for coverage, and understand the sound byte needs of news personnel. PIOs also meet frequently with the chief, in many departments several times a day, to ensure that the public image of the department is consistent with the chief's organizational philosophy. In general, the PIOs and the media personnel were satisfied with their relationship with the media.

However, marketing community policing is a separate and secondary function for most PIOs. It appears that the responsibilities involved in responding to crime incident information requests significantly limit the opportunities to proactively promote community policing in the news. Our research indicates that police departments are not taking full advantage of their access to media organizations to promote community policing. More than half of the media personnel surveyed did not think that law enforcement does a good job promoting community policing. It is important to recognize that news organizations are primarily interested in presenting crime events to the public. Our survey results indicate that crime incidents are high priority news items and community policing is a low priority news item. Moreover, our content analysis indicates that community policing stories were not presented frequently in any of the newspapers examined here, even in those cities where both police and media personnel indicated that the relationship was excellent. Even when community policing is presented, the coverage is narrow, representing a limited view of this philosophy. There is very little discussion of the goals or history of community policing, and citizen

involvement and cooperation is also not frequently mentioned. It would appear that the type of coverage that community policing gets in the news are efforts at public relations, but do not encourage the involvement of citizens in assisting police efforts in community policing.

Law enforcement agencies should consider developing a more focused organizational strategy to publicize community policing using the news media, but also other types of communication strategies. Additional mechanisms to market community policing that need to be explored include the World Wide Web, public service announcements, targeted media campaigns, billboards, public speaking initiatives, and community meeting attendance to increase public exposure to community policing programs. A good model might be the Chicago Police Department. For example, the Chicago Police Department uses multi-media and multi-lingual information campaigns to heighten public awareness of community policing (Chicago Police Department 1998). Included in their efforts are brochures, newsletters, billboards, television and radio advertisements, and informational hotlines. The Chicago Police Department also uses the World Wide Web and airs a community policing television program several times a day. These citywide efforts were combined with community specific outreach and education programs to increase public awareness of community policing in Chicago.

The second policy issue points to the need for additional personnel and resources to be used to market community policing. Sixty-five percent of the departments surveyed had one officer responsible for public information. PIOs do not have enough time and resources to promote community policing in the news with consistency. Law

enforcement agencies should consider providing additional personnel and funds to publicize these programs using a variety of outlets.

The third policy issue raised by our research is the additional needs for training and technical assistance in helping law enforcement agencies develop these broad marketing strategies. We think there are two curriculum issues that need to be addressed. First, we think it is important to develop a curriculum that identifies the range of publicity venues that can be used by law enforcement, and describe how these sources can be put to effective use. Second, there should be a discussion of how to implement a departmental approach to community policing publicity. For example, our survey results indicate that media personnel are more likely to be satisfied with law enforcement publicity efforts when PIOs and community policing personnel share this responsibility. The media results also indicate that individual officers are the most important source for crime incident information. This latter result indicates that reporters do have relationships with a large number of personnel in a department. If all personnel do not completely understand the goals of community policing and the need to generate publicity for events, then it is likely that media personnel may receive mixed signals. In addition, it is apparent that law enforcement management will have to make an effort to emphasize the importance of community policing publicity to media management.

We think that the National Institute of Justice can play an important role by funding research than can support these training efforts and identify whether the implementation of a broad marketing strategy is effective. It is important to look closely at those law enforcement agencies that have implemented "cutting edge" publicity campaigns. It would be helpful to develop an inventory of possible publicity strategies

that other departments can rely on to improve their efforts. In addition, discussing successful publicity efforts will also help identify the organizational hurdles that will need to be addressed, the organizations involved in implementing the publicity strategy (e.g., Did the department rely on business partnerships? How were other organizations brought on board?), and how these organizations were able to broaden the news media's role in community policing publicity.

Finally, we think it is also important to conduct research to examine whether these media awareness efforts are effective. Research should also attempt to document whether citizens and law enforcement officers have a better understanding of community policing efforts after a comprehensive publicity campaign is implemented. In addition, it will be interesting to see whether such an effort improves public support for the police, increases public involvement in community activities, and whether it affects citizen perceptions of crime and fear of crime.

41

REFERENCES

Chermak, Steven M. 1998. "Police, Courts, and Corrections in the Media." In Frankie Bailey and Donna Hale (eds.), Popular Culture, Crime, and Justice. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, pp. 87-99.

Chermak, Steven M. 1995. Victims in the News: Crime and the American News Media. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Chicago Police Department. 1998. CAPS at 5: A Report on the Progress of Community Policing in Chicago. Chicago Police Department.

Editor and Publishing Company. 1995. Editor and Publisher Yearbook. New York: Editor and Publishing Company.

Ericson, Richard V., Patricia M. Baranek, and Janet B.L. Chan, 1989. Negotiating Control: A Study of News Sources. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Graber, Doris. 1980. Crime News and the Public. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Greene, Jack and Steven D. Mastrofski. 1988. Community Policing: Rhetoric of Reality. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Mastrofski, Steven D. 1993. "Varieties of Community Policing." American Journal of Police, 12 (3): 65-77.

O'Keefe, Garrett J., and Kathaleen Reid. 1990. "Media Public Information Campaigns and Criminal Justice Policy-Beyond "McGruff."" In Ray Surette (ed.), The Media and Criminal Justice Policy: Recent Research and Social Effects. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Pate, Anthony M., Paul J. Lavrakas, Mary Ann Wycoff, Wesley G. Skogan, and Lawrence W. Sherman. 1985. Neighborhood Police Newsletters: Experiments in Newark and Houston. Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice, United States Department of Justice.

Riffe, Daniel, Charles F. Aust, and Stephen R. Lacy. 1993. "The Effectiveness of Random, Consecutive Day and Constructed Week Sampling in Newspaper Content Analysis." Journalism Quarterly, 70 (1): 133-139.

Rosenbaum, Dennis P., Arthur J. Lurigio, and Paul J. Lavrakas. 1987. Crime Stoppers: A National Evaluation of Program Operations and Effects. Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice, United States Department of Justice.

Sadd, Susan and Randolph M. Grinc. 1996. Implementation Challenges in Community Policing: Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing in Eight Cities. Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice, United States Department of Justice.

Skogan, Wesley G. 1989. "Communities, Crime, and Neighborhood Organization." *Crime & Delinquency*, 35 (3): 437-457.

Skolnick, Jerome H. and Candace McCoy. 1985. "Police Accountability and the Media." *American Bar Foundation Journal*, 3: 521-557.

Surette, Ray and Alfredo Richard. 1995. "Public Information Officers: A Descriptive Study of Crime News Gatekeepers." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 23 (4): 325-336.

Trojanowicz, Robert and Bonnie Bucqueroux. 1990. Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Company.

Warren Publishing Inc. 1995. Television and Cable Factbook. Washington, D.C.: Warren Publishing Inc.

Williams, Brian N. 1998. Citizen Perspectives on Community Policing. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wycoff, Mary Ann. 1994. "Community Policing Strategies." Draft Final Report. Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice, United States Department of Justice.

List of Appendices

POLICE PUBLIC INFORMATION
OFFICERS SURVEY

This questionnaire explores the public information activities of your law enforcement agency (referred to throughout this questionnaire as "your agency") and should be completed by the person most likely to perform these duties.

In particular, we want to learn about how the public information office is organized, how your law enforcement agency identifies the events, programs, and policies that it wishes to publicize, and how your law enforcement agency coordinates with the news media in the area your law enforcement agency serves.

When answering questions about the news media, please think about newspapers, television, and radio media in your local area only.

If you have any questions about completing the questionnaire, please call the Indiana University Center for Survey Research toll-free at 1-800-258-7691.

1. Does your law enforcement agency have at least one member whose main job is to serve as public information officer? (Please circle response.)

1   yes   (Please answer question 1a.)   **2**   **no**   (Please answer question 1b.)

1a. How many members of your agency are assigned to the public information office?	1b. Since your agency does not have a member specifically designated to serve as public information officer, who performs these duties? (Please list the positions and titles of persons who perform these duties.)
a. _____ # of sworn members b. _____ # of unsworn members	_____ _____ _____

2. Please estimate the **percent** of time you and your staff have spent on each of the following public information activities in the past 12 months:

    a.   providing information about recent crimes: _____ (percent)

    b.   providing information about police initiatives like community policing: _____ (percent)

    c.   providing information about issues of police misconduct: _____ (percent)

    d.   providing information about organizational policy: _____ (percent)

    e.   providing other types of information (please specify below):   _____ (percent)

    _____

    _____

3. For each of the following, please list the number of media outlets you and your staff communicate with **at least once a week:**

    a.   newspapers   _____ (number)

    b.   television stations _____ (number)

    c.   radio stations   _____ (number)

4. In an average week, how many **different reporters** contact you or your staff for information?
    _____ (number)

5. How often do you or your staff meet with your chief executive? (Please circle the **one** response that **best fits** your situation.)

    1   less than once a month
    2   monthly
    3   weekly
    4   daily
    5   several times a day

6. In the past 12 months, how often have you or your staff done each of the following? (Please circle the **one** response that **best fits** your situation.)

		Never	Less Than Once a Month	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
a.	Contacted public information officers in other law enforcement agencies	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Communicated with other public information officers in your jurisdiction (e.g., mayor's office, fire department)	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Communicated with community or business groups	1	2	3	4	5
d.	Issued press releases	1	2	3	4	5
e.	Held meetings with management of local news media outlets	1	2	3	4	5

7. If you or your staff were seeking to publicize a project like bicycle patrols or a new investigative technique what strategy would you **most** likely use? (Please circle only **one** response.)

    1   a press release
    2   communicate directly with media outlets
    3   news conference
    4   describe during a regularly scheduled meeting
    5   other (please specify) _____

7a. Why would you use the method indicated in question 7 above? _____

_____

3

8. In 1996, did your public information budget include specified moneys for publicizing agency activities and programs? (Please circle response.)

1   yes   (Please answer question 8a.)   **2**   **no**   (Please go to question 9.)

↓

8a. What was the specified dollar amount? _____

9. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

		Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a.	Our agency does a good job of publicizing the positive aspects of the agency 1		2	3	4	5	8
b.	Most citizens in the community we serve have a favorable opinion of our agency 1		2	3	4	5	8
c.	Most public information activities in our agency revolve around disseminating information about crimes and criminal investigations 1		2	3	4	5	8
d.	In general, local news media are more interested in reporting about problems in our agency than about our accomplishments 1		2	3	4	5	8
e.	Public information activities are a very important component in maintaining our agency's image 1		2	3	4	5	8
f.	Media images of our agency influence community perceptions about us 1		2	3	4	5	8
g.	Our agency's relationship with local news media is good 1		2	3	4	5	8
h.	Media coverage of law enforcement misconduct in **other** communities adversely affects police-community relations in the community our agency serves 1		2	3	4	5	8
i.	The local news media devote too much attention to crime 1		2	3	4	5	8

10. What, if anything, could be done to improve the quality of the relationships between your agency and the local news media? (Please be specific.)

_____

_____

11. Does your law enforcement agency have a community policing program? (Please circle response.)

1 yes (Please answer question 12.)   2 no (Please go to question 16 on page 6.)

12. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about your community policing program.

		Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a.	Good relationships between the news media and our agency are an important component of our community policing program	1	2	3	4	5	8
b.	In general, when our agency wants to publicize a new community policing activity, the local media are accommodating	1	2	3	4	5	8
c.	Public information duties have been decentralized as part of our community policing program	1	2	3	4	5	8
d.	Community policing has increased the amount of contact between officers in our agency and the news media	1	2	3	4	5	8
e.	Community policing has been an asset for our agency	1	2	3	4	5	8

13. Not including local news media, does your law enforcement agency use other strategies to publicize its community policing program? Examples include newsletters, face-to-face contact, and community meetings. (Please circle response.)

1 yes (Please answer question 13a.)   2 no (Please go to question 14.)

13a. Briefly describe these strategies. _____

_____

_____

5

14. Which of the following do you feel is the **best** way to publicize your community policing efforts? (Please circle **one** response.)

    1   television

    2   newspapers

    3   radio

    4   other (please specify) _____

15. <u>Not including you and your staff</u>, what other units in your law enforcement agency have responsibility for publicizing the agency's community policing efforts? (Please list the **two** units with the **most** responsibility for publicizing this program. **If none, write "none" and go to question 16.**)

    Unit 1 _____

    Unit 2 _____

15a.   In the past 12 months, how often have you had contact with the units listed in question 15 above regarding community policing activities? (Please circle the **one** response that **best fits** the situation **for each unit**.)

<u>Unit 1</u>	<u>Unit 2</u>
1 never	1 never
2 less than once a month	2 less than once a month
3 monthly	3 monthly
4 weekly	4 weekly
5 daily	5 daily

---

16. In the past 12 months, about what percent of the time were you or your staff successful in convincing local news media to carry stories about the positive aspects of your agency?

    _____ (percent)

17. Please list three law enforcement agencies, not including your own, that you think are particularly successful in getting publicity for their community policing efforts.

    a. _____

    b. _____

    c. _____

6

18. What is your position at your agency? _____

19. How long have you served in your current position? _____ **Years** and _____ **Months**

20. What is your rank? _____

21. About how many **hours** of formal training have you received in police-news media relations?

    _____ (hours)

22. Would you say that the amount of formal training you have received in police-news media relations is: (Please circle **one** response.)

    1 more than adequate
    2 about right
    3 not enough

MEDIA REPORTERS
LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES SURVEY

This questionnaire explores relationships between local law enforcement agencies and the news media. In particular, we want to understand the role of the media in the successful implementation of community policing programs in your area. While we are aware that your organization may deal with a large and diverse group of law enforcement agencies, we are specifically interested in your relationships with agencies in medium to large cities in your area; i.e., cities with populations greater than 100,000 persons.

1. Of all the news stories devoted to local crime news, in the past 12 months, about what **percent** was devoted to the following? (Please indicate a percentage for **each** of the topics listed.)

   a. crime incidents and investigations: _____ (percent)

   b. law enforcement programs and initiatives like community policing: _____ (percent)

   c. law enforcement misconduct: _____ (percent)

   d. other criminal justice issues: _____ (percent)

2. Considering all sources that have provided information about local law enforcement agencies in the past 12 months, which of the following was the **most** important to you? (Please circle only **one** response.)

   1 Chief of Police or Sheriff
   2 Public information officer
   3 Other law enforcement agency executive
   4 Individual law enforcement officers
   5 Other (please specify) _____

   2a. Briefly describe why this was the most important source for you. _____
   _____

3. In the past 12 months, about what percent of information regarding crime incidents was provided to you by law enforcement sources?

   _____ (percent)

4. In the past 12 months, about how often did you meet with the police chief(s) or sheriff(s) of local law enforcement agencies? (Please circle the **one** response that **best fits** your situation.)

   1 daily   5 about twice a year
   2 weekly   6 about once a year
   3 semimonthly   7 never
   4 monthly

5. About how many local law enforcement agencies are there in your station's local coverage area?

_____ (number)

6. In general, how accessible to you are the chief executives (e.g., police chief) of local law enforcement agencies? (Please circle **one** response.)

1   very accessible
2   somewhat accessible
3   not very accessible
4   not at all accessible

7. In general, how accessible to you are the public information staffs of local law enforcement agencies? (Please circle **one** response.)

1   very accessible
2   somewhat accessible
3   not very accessible
4   not at all accessible

8. Currently, are there law enforcement agencies with whom you have a **better** relationship than others? (Please circle response.)

1   **yes**   (Please answer question 8a.)   2   **no**   (Please go to question 9.)
↓

8a. Please list some factors that make these relationships better.

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

9. Currently, are there law enforcement agencies with whom you have a more **adversarial** relationship than others? (Please circle response.)

1   **yes**   (Please answer question 9a.)   2   **no**   (Please go to question 10.)
↓

9a. Please list some factors that make these relationships more adversarial.

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

2

10. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

		Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a.	Most citizens in our local coverage area have a favorable opinion of local law enforcement agencies	1	2	3	4	5	8
b.	The local news media play an important role in shaping community perceptions of local law enforcement agencies	1	2	3	4	5	8
c.	My relationship with local law enforcement agencies is generally good	1	2	3	4	5	8
d.	Citizens in our local coverage area are interested in news about local law enforcement agencies	1	2	3	4	5	8
e.	The image of law enforcement that is portrayed in the local media is generally positive	1	2	3	4	5	8
f.	Local law enforcement public information officers do a good job of keeping me informed about *crime incidents*	1	2	3	4	5	8
g.	Local law enforcement public information officers do a good job of keeping me informed about *innovative law enforcement programs*	1	2	3	4	5	8
h.	The information provided in local law enforcement press releases is helpful	1	2	3	4	5	8

11. Are there community policing programs in your station's local coverage area? (Please circle response.)

1   yes   (Please answer question 12.)   2   no   (Please go to question 17 on the next page.)

12. How familiar are you with the various types of community policing activities occurring in your local coverage area? (Please circle only **one** response.)

1   very familiar
2   somewhat familiar
3   not very familiar
4   not at all familiar

13. Considering all sources, in general, who is **most likely** to keep you informed about local law enforcement agencies' community policing activities? (Please circle only **one** response.)

1   Chief of Police or Sheriff
2   Public information officer
3   Other law enforcement executive
4   Individual law enforcement officers
5   Other (please specify) _____

3

14. In the past 12 months, have you done a story that discussed local community policing activities? (Please circle response.)

    1   **yes** (Please answer question 14a.)   **2**   **no** (Please go to question 15.)
    ↓

> 14a. Please indicate the number of community policing stories you have done in the past 12 months. (Please circle **one** response.)
>
>   1   1 to 2 stories   4   8 to 10 stories
>   2   3 to 4 stories   5   11 stories or more
>   3   5 to 7 stories

15. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements.

		Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a.	My relationship with local law enforcement agencies has improved since the introduction of community policing	1	2	3	4	5	8
b.	The public is interested in local community policing activities	1	2	3	4	5	8

16. What would be the **best** way for a law enforcement agency to inform you about a community policing program to increase the likelihood of broadcast? (Please circle only **one** response.)

    1   news conference
    2   press release
    3   public information officer contacting your station directly
    4   other (please specify) _____

17. In the past 12 months, about what percent of the time were local law enforcement agencies able to get coverage of innovative police programs when they sought such coverage from you?
    _____ (percent)

18. What is your title or position? _____

19. How long have you served in your current position? _____

> **Thank You!**
> Center for Survey Research
> 1022 East Third Street
> Bloomington, Indiana 47405

MEDIA MANAGERS
LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES SURVEY

This questionnaire explores relationships between local law enforcement agencies and the news media. In particular, we want to understand the role of the media in the successful implementation of community policing programs in your area. While we are aware that your organization may deal with a large and diverse group of law enforcement agencies, we are specifically interested in your relationships with agencies in medium to large cities in your area; i.e., cities with populations greater than 100,000 persons.

1. Of all the news stories devoted to local crime news, in the past 12 months, about what **percent** was devoted to the following? (Please indicate a percentage for **each** of the topics listed.)

   a. crime incidents and investigations: _____ (percent)

   b. law enforcement programs and initiatives like community policing: _____ (percent)

   c. law enforcement misconduct: _____ (percent)

   d. other criminal justice issues: _____ (percent)

2. Considering all sources that have provided information to your newspaper about local law enforcement agencies in the past 12 months, which of the following was the **most** important? (Please circle only **one** response.)

   1 Chief of Police or Sheriff
   2 Public information officer
   3 Other law enforcement agency executive
   4 Individual law enforcement officers
   5 Other (please specify) _____

   2a. Briefly describe why this was the most important source for your newspaper. _____ _____
   _____
   ---

3. In the past 12 months, about what percent of information regarding crime incidents was provided by law enforcement sources?

   _____ (percent)

4. In the past 12 months, about how often did you meet with the police chief(s) or sheriff(s) of local law enforcement agencies? (Please circle the **one** response that **best fits** your situation.)

   1 weekly   4 about twice a year
   2 semimonthly   5 about once a year
   3 monthly   6 never

5. About how many local law enforcement agencies are there in your newspaper's local coverage area?

    _____ (number)

6. In general, how accessible to your newspaper are the chief executives (e.g., police chief) of local law enforcement agencies? (Please circle **one** response.)

    1   very accessible
    2   somewhat accessible
    3   not very accessible
    4   not at all accessible

7. In general, how accessible to your newspaper are the public information staffs of local law enforcement agencies? (Please circle **one** response.)

    1   very accessible
    2   somewhat accessible
    3   not very accessible
    4   not at all accessible

8. Currently, are there law enforcement agencies with whom your newspaper has a **better** relationship than others? (Please circle response.)

    1   yes (Please answer question 8a.)   2   no (Please go to question 9.)

    8a. Please list some factors that make these relationships better.

        a. _____

        b. _____

        c. _____

9. Currently, are there law enforcement agencies with whom your newspaper has a more **adversarial** relationship than others? (Please circle response.)

    1   yes (Please answer question 9a.)   2   no (Please go to question 10.)

    9a. Please list some factors that make these relationships more adversarial.

        a. _____

        b. _____

        c. _____

2

10. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

		Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a.	Most citizens in our local coverage area have a favorable opinion of local law enforcement agencies	1	2	3	4	5	8
b.	The local news media play an important role in shaping community perceptions of local law enforcement agencies	1	2	3	4	5	8
c.	My newspaper's relationship with local law enforcement agencies is generally good	1	2	3	4	5	8
d.	Citizens in our local coverage area are interested in news about local law enforcement agencies	1	2	3	4	5	8
e.	The image of law enforcement that is portrayed in the local media is generally positive	1	2	3	4	5	8
f.	Local law enforcement public information officers do a good job of keeping my newspaper informed about *crime incidents*	1	2	3	4	5	8
g.	Local law enforcement public information officers do a good job of keeping my newspaper informed about *innovative law enforcement programs*	1	2	3	4	5	8
h.	The information provided in local law enforcement press releases is helpful	1	2	3	4	5	8

11. Are there community policing programs in your newspaper's local coverage area? (Please circle response.)

1   yes   (Please answer question 12.)   2   no   (Please go to question 17 on the next page.)

12. How familiar are you with the various types of community policing activities occurring in your local coverage area? (Please circle **one** response.)

1   very familiar
2   somewhat familiar
3   not very familiar
4   not at all familiar

13. Considering all sources, in general, who is **most likely** to keep your newspaper informed about local law enforcement agencies' community policing activities? (Please circle only **one** response.)

    1   Chief of Police or Sheriff
    2   Public information officer
    3   Other law enforcement executive
    4   Individual law enforcement officers
    5   Other (please specify) _____

14. In the past 12 months, about how often have stories about local community policing appeared in your newspaper? (Please circle the **one** response that **best fits** your situation.)

    1   daily
    2   weekly
    3   monthly
    4   about twice a year
    5   other (please specify) _____

15. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements.

		Strongly Disagree				**Strongly Agree**	**Don't Know**
a.	My newspaper's relationship with local law enforcement agencies has improved since the introduction of community policing	1	2	3	4	5	8
b.	The public is interested in local community policing activities	1	2	3	4	5	8

16. What would be the **best** way for a law enforcement agency to inform your newspaper about a community policing program to increase the likelihood of publication? (Please circle only **one** response.)

    1   news conference
    2   press release
    3   public information officer contacting your newspaper directly
    4   other (please specify) _____

17. In the past 12 months, about what percent of the time were local law enforcement agencies able to get coverage of innovative police programs when they sought such coverage from your newspaper?
    _____ (percent)

18. What is your title or position? _____

19. How long have you served in your current position? _____

Thank You!
Center for Survey Research
1022 East Third Street
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

Frequencies

Statistics

		Case identification number	Q1	Q1A	Q1B	Q1C	Q1D	Q2A
N	Valid	442	442	429	428	429	427	442
	Missing	0	0	13	14	13	15	0

Statistics

		Q2B	Q2C	Q2D	Q2E	Q2A2	Q3	R4
N	Valid	442	442	442	442	442	434	309
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	8	133

Statistics

		M4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q8A	Q8B
N	Valid	130	437	440	433	437	399	393
	Missing	312	5	2	9	5	43	49

Statistics

		Q8C	Q9	Q9A	Q9B	Q9C	Q10A	Q10B
N	Valid	332	427	319	313	241	431	433
	Missing	110	15	123	129	201	11	9

Statistics

		Q10C	Q10D	Q10E	Q10F	Q10G	Q10H	Q11
N	Valid	437	431	432	434	434	436	439
	Missing	5	11	10	8	8	6	3

Statistics

		Q12	Q13A	Q13B	Q13C	Q13D	Q13E	R14
N	Valid	429	431	431	431	431	431	305
	Missing	13	11	11	11	11	11	137

Statistics

		R14A	M14	Q15A	Q15B	Q16A	Q16B	Q16C
N	Valid	259	123	337	414	431	431	431
	Missing	183	319	105	28	11	11	11

Statistics

		Q16D	Q17	Q18	Q19A	Q19B	Q19C	STCD
N	Valid	431	410	442	439	439	439	442
	Missing	11	32	0	3	3	3	0

Statistics

		RTCD	SMPL	MSA	PTCD
N	Valid	442	442	442	442
	Missing	0	0	0	0

Frequency Table

Case identification number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2003	1	.2	.2	.2
	2011	1	.2	.2	.5
	2012	1	.2	.2	.7
	2019	1	.2	.2	.9
	2023	1	.2	.2	1.1
	2026	1	.2	.2	1.4
	2027	1	.2	.2	1.6
	2029	1	.2	.2	1.8
	2031	1	.2	.2	2.0
	2032	1	.2	.2	2.3
	2038	1	.2	.2	2.5
	2047	1	.2	.2	2.7

Case identification number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2058	1	.2	.2	2.9
	2060	1	.2	.2	3.2
	2064	1	.2	.2	3.4
	2067	1	.2	.2	3.6
	2070	1	.2	.2	3.8
	2071	1	.2	.2	4.1
	2072	1	.2	.2	4.3
	2075	1	.2	.2	4.5
	2079	1	.2	.2	4.8
	2080	1	.2	.2	5.0
	2083	1	.2	.2	5.2
	2084	1	.2	.2	5.4
	2088	1	.2	.2	5.7
	2089	1	.2	.2	5.9
	2092	1	.2	.2	6.1
	2093	1	.2	.2	6.3
	2099	1	.2	.2	6.6
	2103	1	.2	.2	6.8
	2106	1	.2	.2	7.0
	2109	1	.2	.2	7.2
	2110	1	.2	.2	7.5
	2111	1	.2	.2	7.7
	2113	1	.2	.2	7.9
	2114	1	.2	.2	8.1
	2118	1	.2	.2	8.4
	2120	1	.2	.2	8.6
	2125	1	.2	.2	8.8
	2127	1	.2	.2	9.0
	2128	1	.2	.2	9.3
	2129	1	.2	.2	9.5
	2130	1	.2	.2	9.7
	2131	1	.2	.2	10.0
	2132	1	.2	.2	10.2
	2133	1	.2	.2	10.4
	2135	1	.2	.2	10.6
	2136	1	.2	.2	10.9
	2137	1	.2	.2	11.1
	2138	1	.2	.2	11.3
	2141	1	.2	.2	11.5
	2142	1	.2	.2	11.8
	2143	1	.2	.2	12.0
	2144	1	.2	.2	12.2
	2145	1	.2	.2	12.4
	2146	1	.2	.2	12.7
	2150	1	.2	.2	12.9
	2154	1	.2	.2	13.1
	2158	1	.2	.2	13.3
	2159	1	.2	.2	13.6
	2161	1	.2	.2	13.8
	2165	1	.2	.2	14.0
	2167	1	.2	.2	14.3

Case identification number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2168	1	.2	.2	14.5
	2169	1	.2	.2	14.7
	2171	1	.2	.2	14.9
	2172	1	.2	.2	15.2
	2173	1	.2	.2	15.4
	2174	1	.2	.2	15.6
	2175	1	.2	.2	15.8
	2176	1	.2	.2	16.1
	2177	1	.2	.2	16.3
	3014	1	.2	.2	16.5
	3018	1	.2	.2	16.7
	3023	1	.2	.2	17.0
	3025	1	.2	.2	17.2
	3026	1	.2	.2	17.4
	3029	1	.2	.2	17.6
	3030	1	.2	.2	17.9
	3033	1	.2	.2	18.1
	3034	1	.2	.2	18.3
	3038	1	.2	.2	18.6
	3041	1	.2	.2	18.8
	3042	1	.2	.2	19.0
	3045	1	.2	.2	19.2
	3046	1	.2	.2	19.5
	3047	1	.2	.2	19.7
	3049	1	.2	.2	19.9
	3053	1	.2	.2	20.1
	3055	1	.2	.2	20.4
	3061	1	.2	.2	20.6
	3062	1	.2	.2	20.8
	3066	1	.2	.2	21.0
	3067	1	.2	.2	21.3
	3071	1	.2	.2	21.5
	3072	1	.2	.2	21.7
	3077	1	.2	.2	21.9
	3079	1	.2	.2	22.2
	3086	1	.2	.2	22.4
	3090	1	.2	.2	22.6
	3092	1	.2	.2	22.9
	3093	1	.2	.2	23.1
	3097	1	.2	.2	23.3
	3101	1	.2	.2	23.5
	3104	1	.2	.2	23.8
	3106	1	.2	.2	24.0
	3111	1	.2	.2	24.2
	3112	1	.2	.2	24.4
	3114	1	.2	.2	24.7
	3117	1	.2	.2	24.9
	3124	1	.2	.2	25.1
	3130	1	.2	.2	25.3
	3134	1	.2	.2	25.6
	3135	1	.2	.2	25.8

Case identification number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3139	1	.2	.2	26.0
	3140	1	.2	.2	26.2
	3143	1	.2	.2	26.5
	3144	1	.2	.2	26.7
	3146	1	.2	.2	26.9
	3147	1	.2	.2	27.1
	3149	1	.2	.2	27.4
	3150	1	.2	.2	27.6
	3151	1	.2	.2	27.8
	3154	1	.2	.2	28.1
	3155	1	.2	.2	28.3
	3156	1	.2	.2	28.5
	3158	1	.2	.2	28.7
	3159	1	.2	.2	29.0
	3162	1	.2	.2	29.2
	3163	1	.2	.2	29.4
	4001	1	.2	.2	29.6
	4002	1	.2	.2	29.9
	4004	1	.2	.2	30.1
	4007	1	.2	.2	30.3
	4009	1	.2	.2	30.5
	4012	1	.2	.2	30.8
	4013	1	.2	.2	31.0
	4015	1	.2	.2	31.2
	4016	1	.2	.2	31.4
	4018	1	.2	.2	31.7
	4019	1	.2	.2	31.9
	4020	1	.2	.2	32.1
	4021	1	.2	.2	32.4
	4027	1	.2	.2	32.6
	4029	1	.2	.2	32.8
	4030	1	.2	.2	33.0
	4031	1	.2	.2	33.3
	4033	1	.2	.2	33.5
	4035	1	.2	.2	33.7
	4036	1	.2	.2	33.9
	4038	1	.2	.2	34.2
	4040	1	.2	.2	34.4
	4042	1	.2	.2	34.6
	4046	1	.2	.2	34.8
	4048	1	.2	.2	35.1
	4049	1	.2	.2	35.3
	4051	1	.2	.2	35.5
	4052	1	.2	.2	35.7
	4056	1	.2	.2	36.0
	4057	1	.2	.2	36.2
	4058	1	.2	.2	36.4
	4059	1	.2	.2	36.7
	4062	1	.2	.2	36.9
	4063	1	.2	.2	37.1
	4065	1	.2	.2	37.3

Page 5

Case identification number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4066	1	.2	.2	37.6
	4067	1	.2	.2	37.8
	4071	1	.2	.2	38.0
	4073	1	.2	.2	38.2
	4076	1	.2	.2	38.5
	4078	1	.2	.2	38.7
	4079	1	.2	.2	38.9
	4080	1	.2	.2	39.1
	4081	1	.2	.2	39.4
	4084	1	.2	.2	39.6
	4086	1	.2	.2	39.8
	4088	1	.2	.2	40.0
	4089	1	.2	.2	40.3
	4092	1	.2	.2	40.5
	4093	1	.2	.2	40.7
	4094	1	.2	.2	41.0
	4095	1	.2	.2	41.2
	4100	1	.2	.2	41.4
	4102	1	.2	.2	41.6
	4107	1	.2	.2	41.9
	4109	1	.2	.2	42.1
	4110	1	.2	.2	42.3
	4112	1	.2	.2	42.5
	4113	1	.2	.2	42.8
	4114	1	.2	.2	43.0
	4115	1	.2	.2	43.2
	4121	1	.2	.2	43.4
	4123	1	.2	.2	43.7
	4124	1	.2	.2	43.9
	4125	1	.2	.2	44.1
	4126	1	.2	.2	44.3
	4128	1	.2	.2	44.6
	4130	1	.2	.2	44.8
	4131	1	.2	.2	45.0
	4133	1	.2	.2	45.2
	4134	1	.2	.2	45.5
	4135	1	.2	.2	45.7
	4136	1	.2	.2	45.9
	4137	1	.2	.2	46.2
	4138	1	.2	.2	46.4
	4139	1	.2	.2	46.6
	4140	1	.2	.2	46.8
	4141	1	.2	.2	47.1
	4143	1	.2	.2	47.3
	4146	1	.2	.2	47.5
	4147	1	.2	.2	47.7
	4148	1	.2	.2	48.0
	4150	1	.2	.2	48.2
	4152	1	.2	.2	48.4
	4153	1	.2	.2	48.6
	4155	1	.2	.2	48.9

Case identification number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4156	1	.2	.2	49.1
	4158	1	.2	.2	49.3
	4160	1	.2	.2	49.5
	4171	1	.2	.2	49.8
	4173	1	.2	.2	50.0
	4174	1	.2	.2	50.2
	4179	1	.2	.2	50.5
	4182	1	.2	.2	50.7
	4188	1	.2	.2	50.9
	4196	1	.2	.2	51.1
	4201	1	.2	.2	51.4
	4203	1	.2	.2	51.6
	4204	1	.2	.2	51.8
	4205	1	.2	.2	52.0
	4206	1	.2	.2	52.3
	4207	1	.2	.2	52.5
	4211	1	.2	.2	52.7
	4212	1	.2	.2	52.9
	4213	1	.2	.2	53.2
	4214	1	.2	.2	53.4
	4217	1	.2	.2	53.6
	4218	1	.2	.2	53.8
	4219	1	.2	.2	54.1
	4221	1	.2	.2	54.3
	4222	1	.2	.2	54.5
	4223	1	.2	.2	54.8
	4224	1	.2	.2	55.0
	4225	1	.2	.2	55.2
	4226	1	.2	.2	55.4
	4233	1	.2	.2	55.7
	4235	1	.2	.2	55.9
	4237	1	.2	.2	56.1
	4238	1	.2	.2	56.3
	4239	1	.2	.2	56.6
	4246	1	.2	.2	56.8
	4248	1	.2	.2	57.0
	4250	1	.2	.2	57.2
	4255	1	.2	.2	57.5
	4256	1	.2	.2	57.7
	4257	1	.2	.2	57.9
	4258	1	.2	.2	58.1
	4262	1	.2	.2	58.4
	4264	1	.2	.2	58.6
	4266	1	.2	.2	58.8
	4270	1	.2	.2	59.0
	4271	1	.2	.2	59.3
	4274	1	.2	.2	59.5
	4275	1	.2	.2	59.7
	4276	1	.2	.2	60.0
	4277	1	.2	.2	60.2
	4281	1	.2	.2	60.4

Case identification number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4282	1	.2	.2	60.6
	4284	1	.2	.2	60.9
	4285	1	.2	.2	61.1
	4294	1	.2	.2	61.3
	4295	1	.2	.2	61.5
	4296	1	.2	.2	61.8
	4297	1	.2	.2	62.0
	4298	1	.2	.2	62.2
	4300	1	.2	.2	62.4
	4301	1	.2	.2	62.7
	4302	1	.2	.2	62.9
	4303	1	.2	.2	63.1
	4304	1	.2	.2	63.3
	4305	1	.2	.2	63.6
	4310	1	.2	.2	63.8
	4311	1	.2	.2	64.0
	4312	1	.2	.2	64.3
	4313	1	.2	.2	64.5
	4318	1	.2	.2	64.7
	4319	1	.2	.2	64.9
	4321	1	.2	.2	65.2
	4322	1	.2	.2	65.4
	4323	1	.2	.2	65.6
	4325	1	.2	.2	65.8
	5006	1	.2	.2	66.1
	5008	1	.2	.2	66.3
	5009	1	.2	.2	66.5
	5010	1	.2	.2	66.7
	5011	1	.2	.2	67.0
	5012	1	.2	.2	67.2
	5014	1	.2	.2	67.4
	5018	1	.2	.2	67.6
	5019	1	.2	.2	67.9
	5020	1	.2	.2	68.1
	5021	1	.2	.2	68.3
	5022	1	.2	.2	68.6
	5023	1	.2	.2	68.8
	5024	1	.2	.2	69.0
	5029	1	.2	.2	69.2
	5032	1	.2	.2	69.5
	5034	1	.2	.2	69.7
	5035	1	.2	.2	69.9
	5040	1	.2	.2	70.1
	5041	1	.2	.2	70.4
	5047	1	.2	.2	70.6
	5048	1	.2	.2	70.8
	5049	1	.2	.2	71.0
	5050	1	.2	.2	71.3
	5051	1	.2	.2	71.5
	5057	1	.2	.2	71.7
	5061	1	.2	.2	71.9

Case identification number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	5062	1	.2	.2	72.2
	5063	1	.2	.2	72.4
	5065	1	.2	.2	72.6
	5070	1	.2	.2	72.9
	5072	1	.2	.2	73.1
	5074	1	.2	.2	73.3
	5075	1	.2	.2	73.5
	5076	1	.2	.2	73.8
	5077	1	.2	.2	74.0
	5078	1	.2	.2	74.2
	5079	1	.2	.2	74.4
	5081	1	.2	.2	74.7
	5084	1	.2	.2	74.9
	5085	1	.2	.2	75.1
	5086	1	.2	.2	75.3
	5089	1	.2	.2	75.6
	5090	1	.2	.2	75.8
	5092	1	.2	.2	76.0
	5096	1	.2	.2	76.2
	5097	1	.2	.2	76.5
	5098	1	.2	.2	76.7
	5099	1	.2	.2	76.9
	5100	1	.2	.2	77.1
	5102	1	.2	.2	77.4
	5106	1	.2	.2	77.6
	5107	1	.2	.2	77.8
	5109	1	.2	.2	78.1
	5110	1	.2	.2	78.3
	5113	1	.2	.2	78.5
	5114	1	.2	.2	78.7
	5117	1	.2	.2	79.0
	5118	1	.2	.2	79.2
	5123	1	.2	.2	79.4
	5124	1	.2	.2	79.6
	5125	1	.2	.2	79.9
	5126	1	.2	.2	80.1
	5128	1	.2	.2	80.3
	5129	1	.2	.2	80.5
	5134	1	.2	.2	80.8
	5136	1	.2	.2	81.0
	5137	1	.2	.2	81.2
	5142	1	.2	.2	81.4
	5144	1	.2	.2	81.7
	5147	1	.2	.2	81.9
	5151	1	.2	.2	82.1
	5152	1	.2	.2	82.4
	5153	1	.2	.2	82.6
	5158	1	.2	.2	82.8
	5159	1	.2	.2	83.0
	5160	1	.2	.2	83.3
	5161	1	.2	.2	83.5

Case identification number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	5163	1	.2	.2	83.7
	5165	1	.2	.2	83.9
	5168	1	.2	.2	84.2
	5170	1	.2	.2	84.4
	5171	1	.2	.2	84.6
	5172	1	.2	.2	84.8
	5173	1	.2	.2	85.1
	5174	1	.2	.2	85.3
	5176	1	.2	.2	85.5
	5177	1	.2	.2	85.7
	5178	1	.2	.2	86.0
	5179	1	.2	.2	86.2
	5180	1	.2	.2	86.4
	5181	1	.2	.2	86.7
	5185	1	.2	.2	86.9
	5186	1	.2	.2	87.1
	5193	1	.2	.2	87.3
	5197	1	.2	.2	87.6
	5199	1	.2	.2	87.8
	5205	1	.2	.2	88.0
	5206	1	.2	.2	88.2
	5207	1	.2	.2	88.5
	5208	1	.2	.2	88.7
	5209	1	.2	.2	88.9
	5211	1	.2	.2	89.1
	5212	1	.2	.2	89.4
	5215	1	.2	.2	89.6
	5218	1	.2	.2	89.8
	5219	1	.2	.2	90.0
	5220	1	.2	.2	90.3
	5222	1	.2	.2	90.5
	5226	1	.2	.2	90.7
	5229	1	.2	.2	91.0
	5231	1	.2	.2	91.2
	5232	1	.2	.2	91.4
	5238	1	.2	.2	91.6
	5239	1	.2	.2	91.9
	5240	1	.2	.2	92.1
	5241	1	.2	.2	92.3
	5243	1	.2	.2	92.5
	5244	1	.2	.2	92.8
	5245	1	.2	.2	93.0
	5246	1	.2	.2	93.2
	5249	1	.2	.2	93.4
	5250	1	.2	.2	93.7
	5251	1	.2	.2	93.9
	5252	1	.2	.2	94.1
	5254	1	.2	.2	94.3
	5255	1	.2	.2	94.6
	5256	1	.2	.2	94.8
	5260	1	.2	.2	95.0

Case identification number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	5261	1	.2	.2	95.2
	5262	1	.2	.2	95.5
	5267	1	.2	.2	95.7
	5269	1	.2	.2	95.9
	5270	1	.2	.2	96.2
	5276	1	.2	.2	96.4
	5279	1	.2	.2	96.6
	5282	1	.2	.2	96.8
	5283	1	.2	.2	97.1
	5285	1	.2	.2	97.3
	5286	1	.2	.2	97.5
	5287	1	.2	.2	97.7
	5289	1	.2	.2	98.0
	5290	1	.2	.2	98.2
	5291	1	.2	.2	98.4
	5292	1	.2	.2	98.6
	5294	1	.2	.2	98.9
	5297	1	.2	.2	99.1
	5298	1	.2	.2	99.3
	5299	1	.2	.2	99.5
	5300	1	.2	.2	99.8
	5301	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	442	100.0	100.0	

Q1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Newspaper Managers	72	16.3	16.3	16.3
	Newspaper Reporters	161	36.4	36.4	52.7
	Television Managers	58	13.1	13.1	65.8
	Television Reporters	151	34.2	34.2	100.0
	Total	442	100.0	100.0	

Q1A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	5	3	.7	.7	.7
	10	5	1.1	1.2	1.9
	12	1	.2	.2	2.1
	15	1	.2	.2	2.3
	18	1	.2	.2	2.6
	20	10	2.3	2.3	4.9
	25	9	2.0	2.1	7.0
	28	1	.2	.2	7.2
	30	11	2.5	2.6	9.8
	35	6	1.4	1.4	11.2
	40	24	5.4	5.6	16.8
	45	7	1.6	1.6	18.4
	48	1	.2	.2	18.6
	50	46	10.4	10.7	29.4
	53	1	.2	.2	29.6
	55	6	1.4	1.4	31.0
	58	1	.2	.2	31.2
	60	62	14.0	14.5	45.7
	65	28	6.3	6.5	52.2
	66	1	.2	.2	52.4
	70	62	14.0	14.5	66.9
	75	47	10.6	11.0	77.9
	80	52	11.8	12.1	90.0
	83	2	.5	.5	90.4
	84	1	.2	.2	90.7
	85	11	2.5	2.6	93.2
	90	22	5.0	5.1	98.4
	92	1	.2	.2	98.6
	93	1	.2	.2	98.8
	95	3	.7	.7	99.5
	98	1	.2	.2	99.8
	percent	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	429	97.1	100.0	
Missing	don't know	3	.7		
	not answered	10	2.3		
	Total	13	2.9		
Total		442	100.0		

Page 12

Q1B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero percent	4	.9	.9	.9
	percent	5	1.1	1.2	2.1
	2	10	2.3	2.3	4.4
	3	9	2.0	2.1	6.5
	4	1	.2	.2	6.8
	5	69	15.6	16.1	22.9
	7	2	.5	.5	23.4
	8	4	.9	.9	24.3
	10	114	25.8	26.6	50.9
	13	1	.2	.2	51.2
	15	56	12.7	13.1	64.3
	18	1	.2	.2	64.5
	19	1	.2	.2	64.7
	20	79	17.9	18.5	83.2
	23	1	.2	.2	83.4
	25	29	6.6	6.8	90.2
	30	20	4.5	4.7	94.9
	35	4	.9	.9	95.8
	40	12	2.7	2.8	98.6
	45	3	.7	.7	99.3
	50	2	.5	.5	99.8
	65	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	428	96.8	100.0	
Missing	don't know	3	.7		
	not answered	11	2.5		
	Total	14	3.2		
Total		442	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero percent	14	3.2	3.3	3.3
	percent	39	8.8	9.1	12.4
	2	30	6.8	7.0	19.3
	3	16	3.6	3.7	23.1
	4	3	.7	.7	23.8
	5	137	31.0	31.9	55.7
	7	4	.9	.9	56.6
	8	5	1.1	1.2	57.8
	10	94	21.3	21.9	79.7
	15	31	7.0	7.2	86.9
	19	1	.2	.2	87.2
	20	28	6.3	6.5	93.7
	25	11	2.5	2.6	96.3
	30	12	2.7	2.8	99.1
	35	2	.5	.5	99.5
	75	1	.2	.2	99.8
	95	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	429	97.1	100.0	
Missing	don't know	3	.7		
	not answered	10	2.3		
	Total	13	2.9		
Total		442	100.0		

Q1D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero percent	34	7.7	8.0	8.0
	percent	13	2.9	3.0	11.0
	2	12	2.7	2.8	13.8
	3	10	2.3	2.3	16.2
	4	8	1.8	1.9	18.0
	5	118	26.7	27.6	45.7
	6	1	.2	.2	45.9
	7	2	.5	.5	46.4
	8	6	1.4	1.4	47.8
	9	3	.7	.7	48.5
	10	98	22.2	23.0	71.4
	12	2	.5	.5	71.9
	13	2	.5	.5	72.4
	14	3	.7	.7	73.1
	15	27	6.1	6.3	79.4
	18	3	.7	.7	80.1
	19	3	.7	.7	80.8
	20	36	8.1	8.4	89.2
	22	1	.2	.2	89.5
	23	1	.2	.2	89.7
	24	2	.5	.5	90.2
	25	14	3.2	3.3	93.4
	30	12	2.7	2.8	96.3
	35	1	.2	.2	96.5
	40	3	.7	.7	97.2
	45	1	.2	.2	97.4
	50	4	.9	.9	98.4
	53	1	.2	.2	98.6
	55	2	.5	.5	99.1
	60	1	.2	.2	99.3
	70	1	.2	.2	99.5
	73	1	.2	.2	99.8
	80	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	427	96.6	100.0	
Missing	don't know	3	.7		
	not answered	12	2.7		
	Total	15	3.4		
Total		442	100.0		

Q2A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	36	8.1	8.1	8.1
	not answered	406	91.9	91.9	100.0
	Total	442	100.0	100.0	

Q2B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	156	35.3	35.3	35.3
	not answered	286	64.7	64.7	100.0
	Total	442	100.0	100.0	

Q2C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	36	8.1	8.1	8.1
	not answered	406	91.9	91.9	100.0
	Total	442	100.0	100.0	

Q2D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	184	41.6	41.6	41.6
	not answered	258	58.4	58.4	100.0
	Total	442	100.0	100.0	

Q2E

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	38	8.6	8.6	8.6
	not answered	404	91.4	91.4	100.0
	Total	442	100.0	100.0	

Q2A2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	421	95.2	95.2	95.2
	not answered	21	4.8	4.8	100.0
	Total	442	100.0	100.0	

Q3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero percent	2	.5	.5	.5
	2	1	.2	.2	.7
	3	1	.2	.2	.9
	5	2	.5	.5	1.4
	10	7	1.6	1.6	3.0
	18	1	.2	.2	3.2
	20	6	1.4	1.4	4.6
	25	5	1.1	1.2	5.8
	30	7	1.6	1.6	7.4
	33	1	.2	.2	7.6
	40	6	1.4	1.4	9.0
	45	1	.2	.2	9.2
	50	34	7.7	7.8	17.1
	54	1	.2	.2	17.3
	60	30	6.8	6.9	24.2
	65	11	2.5	2.5	26.7
	70	23	5.2	5.3	32.0
	75	57	12.9	13.1	45.2
	80	72	16.3	16.6	61.8
	85	34	7.7	7.8	69.6
	87	1	.2	.2	69.8
	90	82	18.6	18.9	88.7
	92	2	.5	.5	89.2
	95	29	6.6	6.7	95.9
	97	2	.5	.5	96.3
	98	2	.5	.5	96.8
	percent	7	1.6	1.6	98.4
	percent	7	1.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	434	98.2	100.0	
Missing	don't know	1	.2		
	not answered	7	1.6		
	Total	8	1.8		
Total		442	100.0		

R4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	daily	25	5.7	8.1	8.1
	weekly	57	12.9	18.4	26.5
	semimonthly	51	11.5	16.5	43.0
	monthly	79	17.9	25.6	68.6
	about twice a year	62	14.0	20.1	88.7
	about once a year	23	5.2	7.4	96.1
	never	11	2.5	3.6	99.7
	two responses circled (specify)	1	.2	.3	100.0
	Total	309	69.9	100.0	
Missing	not answered	3	.7		
	System	130	29.4		
	Total	133	30.1		
Total		442	100.0		

M4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	weekly	8	1.8	6.2	6.2
	semimonthly	9	2.0	6.9	13.1
	monthly	18	4.1	13.8	26.9
	about twice a year	46	10.4	35.4	62.3
	about once a year	37	8.4	28.5	90.8
	never	11	2.5	8.5	99.2
	two responses circled (specify)	1	.2	.8	100.0
	Total	130	29.4	100.0	
Missing	System	312	70.6		
Total		442	100.0		

Q5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	law enforcement agencies	3	.7	.7	.7
	2	4	.9	.9	1.6
	3	9	2.0	2.1	3.7
	4	7	1.6	1.6	5.3
	5	16	3.6	3.7	8.9
	6	17	3.8	3.9	12.8
	7	11	2.5	2.5	15.3
	8	9	2.0	2.1	17.4
	9	7	1.6	1.6	19.0
	10	29	6.6	6.6	25.6
	11	4	.9	.9	26.5
	12	21	4.8	4.8	31.4
	14	3	.7	.7	32.0
	15	29	6.6	6.6	38.7
	16	3	.7	.7	39.4
	17	5	1.1	1.1	40.5
	18	5	1.1	1.1	41.6
	19	1	.2	.2	41.9
	20	46	10.4	10.5	52.4
	21	1	.2	.2	52.6
	23	3	.7	.7	53.3
	24	8	1.8	1.8	55.1
	25	18	4.1	4.1	59.3
	26	1	.2	.2	59.5
	28	1	.2	.2	59.7
	30	30	6.8	6.9	66.6
	32	1	.2	.2	66.8
	33	1	.2	.2	67.0
	35	12	2.7	2.7	69.8
	36	1	.2	.2	70.0
	40	18	4.1	4.1	74.1
	41	1	.2	.2	74.4
	42	1	.2	.2	74.6
	45	3	.7	.7	75.3

Q5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	50	31	7.0	7.1	82.4
	55	1	.2	.2	82.6
	60	11	2.5	2.5	85.1
	65	1	.2	.2	85.4
	70	4	.9	.9	86.3
	75	4	.9	.9	87.2
	80	1	.2	.2	87.4
	90	1	.2	.2	87.6
	100	23	5.2	5.3	92.9
	120	2	.5	.5	93.4
	125	1	.2	.2	93.6
	150	6	1.4	1.4	95.0
	160	1	.2	.2	95.2
	200	4	.9	.9	96.1
	300	2	.5	.5	96.6
	390	1	.2	.2	96.8
	400	1	.2	.2	97.0
	500	1	.2	.2	97.3
	600	1	.2	.2	97.5
	can't estimate	11	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	437	98.9	100.0	
Missing	don't know	1	.2		
	not answered	4	.9		
	Total	5	1.1		
Total		442	100.0		

Q6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	very accessible	113	25.6	25.7	25.7
	somewhat accessible	232	52.5	52.7	78.4
	not very accessible	87	19.7	19.8	98.2
	not at all accessible	8	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	440	99.5	100.0	
Missing	not answered	2	.5		
Total		442	100.0		

Q7

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	very accessible	262	59.3	60.5	60.5
	somewhat accessible	145	32.8	33.5	94.0
	not very accessible	18	4.1	4.2	98.2
	not at all accessible	8	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	433	98.0	100.0	
Missing	not answered	9	2.0		
Total		442	100.0		

Q8

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes (Please answer question 8a.)	399	90.3	91.3	91.3
	no (Please go to question 9.)	38	8.6	8.7	100.0
	Total	437	98.9	100.0	
Missing	not answered	5	1.1		
Total		442	100.0		

Q8A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	393	88.9	98.5	98.5
	not answered (goto q9)	6	1.4	1.5	100.0
	Total	399	90.3	100.0	
Missing	System	43	9.7		
Total		442	100.0		

Q8B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	332	75.1	84.5	84.5
	not answered (goto q9)	61	13.8	15.5	100.0
	Total	393	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	49	11.1		
Total		442	100.0		

Q8C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	208	47.1	62.7	62.7
	not answered	124	28.1	37.3	100.0
	Total	332	75.1	100.0	
Missing	System	110	24.9		
Total		442	100.0		

Q9

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes (Please answer question 9a.)	319	72.2	74.7	74.7
	no (Please go to question 10.)	108	24.4	25.3	100.0
	Total	427	96.6	100.0	
Missing	not answered	15	3.4		
Total		442	100.0		

Q9A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	313	70.8	98.1	98.1
	not answered	6	1.4	1.9	100.0
	Total	319	72.2	100.0	
Missing	System	123	27.8		
Total		442	100.0		

Q9B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	241	54.5	77.0	77.0
	not answered	72	16.3	23.0	100.0
	Total	313	70.8	100.0	
Missing	System	129	29.2		
Total		442	100.0		

Q9C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	153	34.6	63.5	63.5
	not answered	88	19.9	36.5	100.0
	Total	241	54.5	100.0	
Missing	System	201	45.5		
Total		442	100.0		

Q10A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	7	1.6	1.6	1.6
	2	41	9.3	9.5	11.1
	3	152	34.4	35.3	46.4
	4	195	44.1	45.2	91.6
	strongly agree	36	8.1	8.4	100.0
	Total	431	97.5	100.0	
Missing	don't know	6	1.4		
	not answered	5	1.1		
	Total	11	2.5		
Total		442	100.0		

Q10B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	10	2.3	2.3	2.3
	2	23	5.2	5.3	7.6
	3	59	13.3	13.6	21.2
	4	182	41.2	42.0	63.3
	strongly agree	159	36.0	36.7	100.0
	Total	433	98.0	100.0	
Missing	don't know	4	.9		
	not answered	5	1.1		
	Total	9	2.0		
Total		442	100.0		

Q10C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	8	1.8	1.8	1.8
	2	22	5.0	5.0	6.9
	3	92	20.8	21.1	27.9
	4	186	42.1	42.6	70.5
	strongly agree	129	29.2	29.5	100.0
	Total	437	98.9	100.0	
Missing	don't know	1	.2		
	not answered	4	.9		
	Total	5	1.1		
Total		442	100.0		

Q10D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	5	1.1	1.2	1.2
	2	10	2.3	2.3	3.5
	3	70	15.8	16.2	19.7
	4	196	44.3	45.5	65.2
	strongly agree	150	33.9	34.8	100.0
	Total	431	97.5	100.0	
Missing	don't know	5	1.1		
	not answered	6	1.4		
	Total	11	2.5		
Total		442	100.0		

Q10E

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	5	1.1	1.2	1.2
	2	24	5.4	5.6	6.7
	3	162	36.7	37.5	44.2
	4	195	44.1	45.1	89.4
	strongly agree	46	10.4	10.6	100.0
	Total	432	97.7	100.0	
Missing	don't know	4	.9		
	not answered	6	1.4		
	Total	10	2.3		
Total		442	100.0		

Q10F

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	40	9.0	9.2	9.2
	2	92	20.8	21.2	30.4
	3	130	29.4	30.0	60.4
	4	135	30.5	31.1	91.5
	strongly agree	37	8.4	8.5	100.0
	Total	434	98.2	100.0	
Missing	don't know	2	.5		
	not answered	6	1.4		
	Total	8	1.8		
Total		442	100.0		

Q10G

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	40	9.0	9.2	9.2
	2	87	19.7	20.0	29.3
	3	113	25.6	26.0	55.3
	4	124	28.1	28.6	83.9
	strongly agree	70	15.8	16.1	100.0
	Total	434	98.2	100.0	
Missing	don't know	2	.5		
	not answered	6	1.4		
	Total	8	1.8		
Total		442	100.0		

Q10H

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	26	5.9	6.0	6.0
	2	85	19.2	19.5	25.5
	3	138	31.2	31.7	57.1
	4	144	32.6	33.0	90.1
	strongly agree	43	9.7	9.9	100.0
	Total	436	98.6	100.0	
Missing	don't know	2	.5		
	not answered	4	.9		
	Total	6	1.4		
Total		442	100.0		

Q11

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes (Please answer question 12.)	431	97.5	98.2	98.2
	no (Please go to question 17.)	8	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	439	99.3	100.0	
Missing	don't know	1	.2		
	not answered	2	.5		
	Total	3	.7		
Total		442	100.0		

Q12

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	very familiar	187	42.3	43.6	43.6
	somewhat familiar	216	48.9	50.3	93.9
	not very familiar	24	5.4	5.6	99.5
	not at all familiar	2	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	429	97.1	100.0	
Missing	not answered	2	.5		
	System	11	2.5		
	Total	13	2.9		
Total		442	100.0		

Q13A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	56	12.7	13.0	13.0
	not answered	375	84.8	87.0	100.0
	Total	431	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	2.5		
Total		442	100.0		

Q13B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	212	48.0	49.2	49.2
	not answered	219	49.5	50.8	100.0
	Total	431	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	2.5		
Total		442	100.0		

Q13C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	49	11.1	11.4	11.4
	not answered	382	86.4	88.6	100.0
	Total	431	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	2.5		
Total		442	100.0		

Q13D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	87	19.7	20.2	20.2
	not answered	344	77.8	79.8	100.0
	Total	431	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	2.5		
Total		442	100.0		

Q13E

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	37	8.4	8.6	8.6
	not answered	394	89.1	91.4	100.0
	Total	431	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	2.5		
Total		442	100.0		

R14

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes (Please answer question 14a.)	262	59.3	85.9	85.9
	no (Please go to question 15.)	43	9.7	14.1	100.0
	Total	305	69.0	100.0	
Missing	System	137	31.0		
Total		442	100.0		

R14A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 to 2 stories	53	12.0	20.5	20.5
	3 to 4 stories	74	16.7	28.6	49.0
	5 to 7 stories	65	14.7	25.1	74.1
	8 to 10 stories	33	7.5	12.7	86.9
	11 stories or more	34	7.7	13.1	100.0
	Total	259	58.6	100.0	
Missing	not answered	3	.7		
	System	180	40.7		
	Total	183	41.4		
Total		442	100.0		

M14

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	daily	2	.5	1.6	1.6
	weekly	19	4.3	15.4	17.1
	monthly	57	12.9	46.3	63.4
	about twice a year	29	6.6	23.6	87.0
	other (please specify)	15	3.4	12.2	99.2
	two responses circled (specify)	1	.2	.8	100.0
	Total	123	27.8	100.0	
Missing	don't know	2	.5		
	not answered	1	.2		
	System	316	71.5		
	Total	319	72.2		
Total		442	100.0		

Q15A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	46	10.4	13.6	13.6
	2	67	15.2	19.9	33.5
	3	146	33.0	43.3	76.9
	4	63	14.3	18.7	95.5
	strongly agree	15	3.4	4.5	100.0
	Total	337	76.2	100.0	
Missing	don't know	91	20.6		
	not answered	3	.7		
	System	11	2.5		
	Total	105	23.8		
Total		442	100.0		

Q15B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	5	1.1	1.2	1.2
	2	24	5.4	5.8	7.0
	3	96	21.7	23.2	30.2
	4	196	44.3	47.3	77.5
	strongly agree	93	21.0	22.5	100.0
	Total	414	93.7	100.0	
Missing	don't know	12	2.7		
	not answered	5	1.1		
	System	11	2.5		
	Total	28	6.3		
Total		442	100.0		

Q16A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	48	10.9	11.1	11.1
	not answered	383	86.7	88.9	100.0
	Total	431	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	2.5		
Total		442	100.0		

Q16B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	32	7.2	7.4	7.4
	not answered	399	90.3	92.6	100.0
	Total	431	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	2.5		
Total		442	100.0		

Q16C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	298	67.4	69.1	69.1
	not answered	133	30.1	30.9	100.0
	Total	431	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	2.5		
Total		442	100.0		

Q16D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered(specify)	66	14.9	15.3	15.3
	not answered	365	82.6	84.7	100.0
	Total	431	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	2.5		
Total		442	100.0		

Q17

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero percent	5	1.1	1.2	1.2
	percent	1	.2	.2	1.5
	5	6	1.4	1.5	2.9
	10	5	1.1	1.2	4.1
	15	1	.2	.2	4.4
	20	9	2.0	2.2	6.6
	25	5	1.1	1.2	7.8
	30	6	1.4	1.5	9.3
	33	1	.2	.2	9.5
	40	6	1.4	1.5	11.0
	50	33	7.5	8.0	19.0
	60	16	3.6	3.9	22.9
	62	1	.2	.2	23.2
	63	1	.2	.2	23.4
	65	4	.9	1.0	24.4
	70	12	2.7	2.9	27.3
	75	47	10.6	11.5	38.8
	78	1	.2	.2	39.0
	80	39	8.8	9.5	48.5
	85	16	3.6	3.9	52.4
	90	63	14.3	15.4	67.8
	93	2	.5	.5	68.3
	95	35	7.9	8.5	76.8
	98	4	.9	1.0	77.8
	percent	11	2.5	2.7	80.5
	percent	76	17.2	18.5	99.0
	can't estimate	4	.9	1.0	100.0
	Total	410	92.8	100.0	
Missing	don't know	10	2.3		
	not answered	22	5.0		
	Total	32	7.2		
Total		442	100.0		

Q18

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	439	99.3	99.3	99.3
	not answered	3	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	442	100.0	100.0	

Page 28

Q19A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero years	58	13.1	13.2	13.2
	years	91	20.6	20.7	33.9
	2	76	17.2	17.3	51.3
	3	34	7.7	7.7	59.0
	4	23	5.2	5.2	64.2
	5	22	5.0	5.0	69.2
	6	13	2.9	3.0	72.2
	7	22	5.0	5.0	77.2
	8	12	2.7	2.7	80.0
	9	9	2.0	2.1	82.0
	10	16	3.6	3.6	85.6
	11	9	2.0	2.1	87.7
	12	6	1.4	1.4	89.1
	13	5	1.1	1.1	90.2
	14	3	.7	.7	90.9
	15	7	1.6	1.6	92.5
	16	3	.7	.7	93.2
	17	6	1.4	1.4	94.5
	18	7	1.6	1.6	96.1
	19	4	.9	.9	97.0
	20	3	.7	.7	97.7
	22	1	.2	.2	97.9
	24	1	.2	.2	98.2
	25	2	.5	.5	98.6
	26	1	.2	.2	98.9
	29	2	.5	.5	99.3
	30	3	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	439	99.3	100.0	
Missing	not answered	3	.7		
Total		442	100.0		

Q19B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero months	182	41.2	41.5	41.5
	months	11	2.5	2.5	44.0
	2	28	6.3	6.4	50.3
	3	31	7.0	7.1	57.4
	4	27	6.1	6.2	63.6
	5	25	5.7	5.7	69.2
	6	69	15.6	15.7	85.0
	7	21	4.8	4.8	89.7
	8	14	3.2	3.2	92.9
	9	13	2.9	3.0	95.9
	10	9	2.0	2.1	97.9
	11	8	1.8	1.8	99.8
	can't estimate	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	439	99.3	100.0	
Missing	not answered	3	.7		
Total		442	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero	14	3.2	3.2	3.2
	years	118	26.7	26.9	30.1
	2	67	15.2	15.3	45.3
	3	49	11.1	11.2	56.5
	4	30	6.8	6.8	63.3
	5	20	4.5	4.6	67.9
	6	14	3.2	3.2	71.1
	7	24	5.4	5.5	76.5
	8	13	2.9	3.0	79.5
	9	8	1.8	1.8	81.3
	10	18	4.1	4.1	85.4
	11	7	1.6	1.6	87.0
	12	7	1.6	1.6	88.6
	13	7	1.6	1.6	90.2
	14	1	.2	.2	90.4
	15	8	1.8	1.8	92.3
	16	4	.9	.9	93.2
	17	6	1.4	1.4	94.5
	18	5	1.1	1.1	95.7
	19	4	.9	.9	96.6
	20	4	.9	.9	97.5
	21	1	.2	.2	97.7
	22	1	.2	.2	97.9
	24	1	.2	.2	98.2
	25	2	.5	.5	98.6
	26	1	.2	.2	98.9
	29	2	.5	.5	99.3
	30	3	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	439	99.3	100.0	
Missing	not answered	3	.7		
Total		442	100.0		

STCD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Alabama	9	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Alaska	2	.5	.5	2.5
	Arizona	10	2.3	2.3	4.8
	Arkansas	4	.9	.9	5.7
	California	52	11.8	11.8	17.4
	Colorado	12	2.7	2.7	20.1
	Connecticut	9	2.0	2.0	22.2
	District of Columbia	3	.7	.7	22.9
	Florida	19	4.3	4.3	27.1
	Georgia	16	3.6	3.6	30.8
	Hawaii	5	1.1	1.1	31.9
	Idaho	5	1.1	1.1	33.0
	Illinois	18	4.1	4.1	37.1
	Indiana	12	2.7	2.7	39.8
	Iowa	6	1.4	1.4	41.2
	Kansas	7	1.6	1.6	42.8
	Kentucky	7	1.6	1.6	44.3
	Louisiana	11	2.5	2.5	46.8
	Maryland	4	.9	.9	47.7
	Massachusetts	5	1.1	1.1	48.9
	Michigan	10	2.3	2.3	51.1
	Minnesota	3	.7	.7	51.8
	Mississippi	2	.5	.5	52.3
	Missouri	7	1.6	1.6	53.8
	Nebraska	9	2.0	2.0	55.9
	Nevada	7	1.6	1.6	57.5
	New Hampshire	3	.7	.7	58.1
	New Jersey	2	.5	.5	58.6
	New Mexico	2	.5	.5	59.0
	New York	12	2.7	2.7	61.8
	North Carolina	18	4.1	4.1	65.8
	Ohio	17	3.8	3.8	69.7
	Oklahoma	7	1.6	1.6	71.3
	Oregon	8	1.8	1.8	73.1
	Pennsylvania	11	2.5	2.5	75.6
	Rhode Island	1	.2	.2	75.8
	South Carolina	4	.9	.9	76.7
	South Dakota	5	1.1	1.1	77.8
	Tennessee	8	1.8	1.8	79.6
	Texas	47	10.6	10.6	90.3
	Utah	4	.9	.9	91.2
	Virginia	12	2.7	2.7	93.9
	Washington	16	3.6	3.6	97.5
	Wisconsin	11	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	442	100.0	100.0	

RTCD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Returned after 1st mailing but before postcard	232	52.5	52.5	52.5
	Returned after postcard but before 2nd mailing	92	20.8	20.8	73.3
	Returned after 2nd mailing	118	26.7	26.7	100.0
	Total	442	100.0	100.0	

SMPL

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Newspaper Manager	72	16.3	16.3	16.3
	TV Manager	58	13.1	13.1	29.4
	Newspaper Reporter	161	36.4	36.4	65.8
	TV Reporter	151	34.2	34.2	100.0
	Total	442	100.0	100.0	

MSA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	40	2	.5	.5	.5
	80	1	.2	.2	.7
	160	1	.2	.2	.9
	200	2	.5	.5	1.4
	240	1	.2	.2	1.6
	320	4	.9	.9	2.5
	380	2	.5	.5	2.9
	440	3	.7	.7	3.6
	520	3	.7	.7	4.3
	640	4	.9	.9	5.2
	680	2	.5	.5	5.7
	720	6	1.4	1.4	7.0
	760	4	.9	.9	7.9
	840	1	.2	.2	8.1
	1080	5	1.1	1.1	9.3
	1123	6	1.4	1.4	10.6
	1240	3	.7	.7	11.3
	1280	4	.9	.9	12.2
	1360	2	.5	.5	12.7
	1520	1	.2	.2	12.9
	1560	2	.5	.5	13.3
	1600	5	1.1	1.1	14.5
	1640	2	.5	.5	14.9
	1680	8	1.8	1.8	16.7
	1720	3	.7	.7	17.4
	1760	4	.9	.9	18.3
	1800	6	1.4	1.4	19.7
	1840	2	.5	.5	20.1
	1880	3	.7	.7	20.8
	1920	5	1.1	1.1	21.9

MSA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2000	3	.7	.7	22.6
	2080	6	1.4	1.4	24.0
	2120	4	.9	.9	24.9
	2160	1	.2	.2	25.1
	2320	3	.7	.7	25.8
	2360	3	.7	.7	26.5
	2400	4	.9	.9	27.4
	2440	2	.5	.5	27.8
	2560	1	.2	.2	28.1
	2640	1	.2	.2	28.3
	2670	1	.2	.2	28.5
	2680	2	.5	.5	29.0
	2760	5	1.1	1.1	30.1
	2800	3	.7	.7	30.8
	2840	5	1.1	1.1	31.9
	2900	4	.9	.9	32.8
	2960	1	.2	.2	33.0
	3000	2	.5	.5	33.5
	3080	4	.9	.9	34.4
	3120	8	1.8	1.8	36.2
	3283	3	.7	.7	36.9
	3320	5	1.1	1.1	38.0
	3360	3	.7	.7	38.7
	3440	4	.9	.9	39.6
	3480	1	.2	.2	39.8
	3560	2	.5	.5	40.3
	3600	1	.2	.2	40.5
	3640	1	.2	.2	40.7
	3760	5	1.1	1.1	41.9
	3810	1	.2	.2	42.1
	3840	3	.7	.7	42.8
	3880	3	.7	.7	43.4
	4040	3	.7	.7	44.1
	4080	4	.9	.9	45.0
	4120	3	.7	.7	45.7
	4200	2	.5	.5	46.2
	4280	4	.9	.9	47.1
	4360	4	.9	.9	48.0
	4400	4	.9	.9	48.9
	4480	12	2.7	2.7	51.6
	4520	3	.7	.7	52.3
	4600	4	.9	.9	53.2
	4680	2	.5	.5	53.6
	4720	5	1.1	1.1	54.8
	4880	2	.5	.5	55.2
	4920	2	.5	.5	55.7
	5000	2	.5	.5	56.1
	5080	2	.5	.5	56.6
	5120	3	.7	.7	57.2
	5160	3	.7	.7	57.9
	5170	1	.2	.2	58.1

MSA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	5240	2	.5	.5	58.6
	5360	1	.2	.2	58.8
	5483	6	1.4	1.4	60.2
	5560	2	.5	.5	60.6
	5600	3	.7	.7	61.3
	5640	1	.2	.2	61.5
	5720	10	2.3	2.3	63.8
	5775	4	.9	.9	64.7
	5880	2	.5	.5	65.2
	5920	5	1.1	1.1	66.3
	5945	1	.2	.2	66.5
	5960	2	.5	.5	67.0
	6120	4	.9	.9	67.9
	6160	4	.9	.9	68.8
	6200	7	1.6	1.6	70.4
	6280	3	.7	.7	71.0
	6440	4	.9	.9	71.9
	6483	1	.2	.2	72.2
	6560	2	.5	.5	72.6
	6640	8	1.8	1.8	74.4
	6720	4	.9	.9	75.3
	6760	2	.5	.5	75.8
	6780	4	.9	.9	76.7
	6840	1	.2	.2	76.9
	6880	4	.9	.9	77.8
	6920	3	.7	.7	78.5
	7040	1	.2	.2	78.7
	7080	2	.5	.5	79.2
	7120	2	.5	.5	79.6
	7160	4	.9	.9	80.5
	7240	3	.7	.7	81.2
	7320	6	1.4	1.4	82.6
	7360	3	.7	.7	83.3
	7400	2	.5	.5	83.7
	7500	1	.2	.2	83.9
	7520	5	1.1	1.1	85.1
	7600	7	1.6	1.6	86.7
	7680	2	.5	.5	87.1
	7760	5	1.1	1.1	88.2
	7800	3	.7	.7	88.9
	7840	3	.7	.7	89.6
	7880	5	1.1	1.1	90.7
	7920	2	.5	.5	91.2
	8003	1	.2	.2	91.4
	8120	2	.5	.5	91.9
	8160	3	.7	.7	92.5
	8200	4	.9	.9	93.4
	8240	3	.7	.7	94.1
	8280	5	1.1	1.1	95.2
	8400	1	.2	.2	95.5
	8440	3	.7	.7	96.2

MSA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	8520	3	.7	.7	96.8
	8560	3	.7	.7	97.5
	8735	2	.5	.5	98.0
	8780	1	.2	.2	98.2
	8800	1	.2	.2	98.4
	8840	3	.7	.7	99.1
	9040	3	.7	.7	99.8
	9080	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	442	100.0	100.0	

PTCD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1001	1	.2	.2	.2
	1002	1	.2	.2	.5
	1003	1	.2	.2	.7
	1004	2	.5	.5	1.1
	1005	1	.2	.2	1.4
	1006	2	.5	.5	1.8
	1007	1	.2	.2	2.0
	1008	3	.7	.7	2.7
	1009	1	.2	.2	2.9
	1010	1	.2	.2	3.2
	1011	2	.5	.5	3.6
	1012	3	.7	.7	4.3
	1013	1	.2	.2	4.5
	1015	3	.7	.7	5.2
	1018	3	.7	.7	5.9
	1020	1	.2	.2	6.1
	1022	3	.7	.7	6.8
	1023	3	.7	.7	7.5
	1024	3	.7	.7	8.1
	1025	1	.2	.2	8.4
	1028	1	.2	.2	8.6
	1029	2	.5	.5	9.0
	1030	1	.2	.2	9.3
	1031	1	.2	.2	9.5
	1032	2	.5	.5	10.0
	1033	3	.7	.7	10.6
	1034	2	.5	.5	11.1
	1035	2	.5	.5	11.5
	1036	1	.2	.2	11.8
	1037	1	.2	.2	12.0
	1038	2	.5	.5	12.4
	1039	1	.2	.2	12.7
	1040	1	.2	.2	12.9
	1041	1	.2	.2	13.1
	1042	1	.2	.2	13.3
	1045	1	.2	.2	13.6
	1046	2	.5	.5	14.0

PTCD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1047	2	.5	.5	14.5
	1048	1	.2	.2	14.7
	1050	1	.2	.2	14.9
	1051	2	.5	.5	15.4
	1052	3	.7	.7	16.1
	1053	2	.5	.5	16.5
	1054	1	.2	.2	16.7
	1055	1	.2	.2	17.0
	1056	2	.5	.5	17.4
	1057	1	.2	.2	17.6
	1058	1	.2	.2	17.9
	1059	2	.5	.5	18.3
	1060	2	.5	.5	18.8
	1061	2	.5	.5	19.2
	1062	1	.2	.2	19.5
	1063	1	.2	.2	19.7
	1065	1	.2	.2	19.9
	1066	1	.2	.2	20.1
	1067	1	.2	.2	20.4
	1068	2	.5	.5	20.8
	1069	1	.2	.2	21.0
	1070	1	.2	.2	21.3
	1072	1	.2	.2	21.5
	1073	1	.2	.2	21.7
	1075	2	.5	.5	22.2
	1076	2	.5	.5	22.6
	1077	1	.2	.2	22.9
	1078	1	.2	.2	23.1
	1079	1	.2	.2	23.3
	1080	1	.2	.2	23.5
	1081	1	.2	.2	23.8
	1082	2	.5	.5	24.2
	1083	1	.2	.2	24.4
	1084	1	.2	.2	24.7
	1085	2	.5	.5	25.1
	1086	2	.5	.5	25.6
	1087	2	.5	.5	26.0
	1088	2	.5	.5	26.5
	1089	1	.2	.2	26.7
	1090	3	.7	.7	27.4
	1091	2	.5	.5	27.8
	1092	2	.5	.5	28.3
	1093	2	.5	.5	28.7
	1097	1	.2	.2	29.0
	1099	1	.2	.2	29.2
	1100	1	.2	.2	29.4
	1102	1	.2	.2	29.6
	1103	1	.2	.2	29.9
	1104	1	.2	.2	30.1
	1105	2	.5	.5	30.5
	1106	1	.2	.2	30.8

PTCD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1107	1	.2	.2	31.0
	1108	1	.2	.2	31.2
	1112	1	.2	.2	31.4
	1113	3	.7	.7	32.1
	1114	2	.5	.5	32.6
	1115	1	.2	.2	32.8
	1116	1	.2	.2	33.0
	1117	1	.2	.2	33.3
	1118	1	.2	.2	33.5
	1119	2	.5	.5	33.9
	1121	1	.2	.2	34.2
	1122	1	.2	.2	34.4
	1123	2	.5	.5	34.8
	1124	2	.5	.5	35.3
	1126	1	.2	.2	35.5
	1127	1	.2	.2	35.7
	1128	2	.5	.5	36.2
	1129	2	.5	.5	36.7
	1130	2	.5	.5	37.1
	1131	1	.2	.2	37.3
	1132	1	.2	.2	37.6
	1133	2	.5	.5	38.0
	1134	1	.2	.2	38.2
	1135	3	.7	.7	38.9
	1136	3	.7	.7	39.6
	1137	1	.2	.2	39.8
	1138	2	.5	.5	40.3
	1139	2	.5	.5	40.7
	1141	3	.7	.7	41.4
	1142	2	.5	.5	41.9
	1144	2	.5	.5	42.3
	1145	1	.2	.2	42.5
	1146	1	.2	.2	42.8
	1147	3	.7	.7	43.4
	1149	3	.7	.7	44.1
	1150	2	.5	.5	44.6
	1151	1	.2	.2	44.8
	1152	1	.2	.2	45.0
	1153	2	.5	.5	45.5
	1154	1	.2	.2	45.7
	1156	2	.5	.5	46.2
	1157	1	.2	.2	46.4
	1158	3	.7	.7	47.1
	1159	2	.5	.5	47.5
	1160	1	.2	.2	47.7
	1162	2	.5	.5	48.2
	1163	2	.5	.5	48.6
	1164	2	.5	.5	49.1
	1166	1	.2	.2	49.3
	1167	1	.2	.2	49.5
	1168	1	.2	.2	49.8

PTCD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1169	3	.7	.7	50.5
	1170	2	.5	.5	50.9
	1171	1	.2	.2	51.1
	1174	2	.5	.5	51.6
	1175	1	.2	.2	51.8
	1176	1	.2	.2	52.0
	1178	2	.5	.5	52.5
	1179	1	.2	.2	52.7
	2001	1	.2	.2	52.9
	2004	2	.5	.5	53.4
	2005	1	.2	.2	53.6
	2006	2	.5	.5	54.1
	2007	3	.7	.7	54.8
	2009	2	.5	.5	55.2
	2010	1	.2	.2	55.4
	2011	1	.2	.2	55.7
	2013	2	.5	.5	56.1
	2014	1	.2	.2	56.3
	2016	1	.2	.2	56.6
	2017	1	.2	.2	56.8
	2019	1	.2	.2	57.0
	2020	1	.2	.2	57.2
	2021	1	.2	.2	57.5
	2023	1	.2	.2	57.7
	2025	3	.7	.7	58.4
	2026	2	.5	.5	58.8
	2027	2	.5	.5	59.3
	2028	1	.2	.2	59.5
	2029	2	.5	.5	60.0
	2030	2	.5	.5	60.4
	2031	2	.5	.5	60.9
	2032	1	.2	.2	61.1
	2033	2	.5	.5	61.5
	2035	2	.5	.5	62.0
	2036	2	.5	.5	62.4
	2037	2	.5	.5	62.9
	2038	3	.7	.7	63.6
	2039	3	.7	.7	64.3
	2041	1	.2	.2	64.5
	2042	3	.7	.7	65.2
	2043	2	.5	.5	65.6
	2044	2	.5	.5	66.1
	2046	1	.2	.2	66.3
	2047	2	.5	.5	66.7
	2049	2	.5	.5	67.2
	2050	2	.5	.5	67.6
	2051	2	.5	.5	68.1
	2052	1	.2	.2	68.3
	2053	2	.5	.5	68.8
	2054	2	.5	.5	69.2
	2055	2	.5	.5	69.7

PTCD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2057	2	.5	.5	70.1
	2058	2	.5	.5	70.6
	2059	1	.2	.2	70.8
	2061	1	.2	.2	71.0
	2062	2	.5	.5	71.5
	2064	1	.2	.2	71.7
	2065	1	.2	.2	71.9
	2066	2	.5	.5	72.4
	2067	1	.2	.2	72.6
	2068	1	.2	.2	72.9
	2069	1	.2	.2	73.1
	2070	1	.2	.2	73.3
	2071	1	.2	.2	73.5
	2072	2	.5	.5	74.0
	2073	3	.7	.7	74.7
	2074	1	.2	.2	74.9
	2075	1	.2	.2	75.1
	2076	2	.5	.5	75.6
	2077	3	.7	.7	76.2
	2078	3	.7	.7	76.9
	2079	2	.5	.5	77.4
	2080	2	.5	.5	77.8
	2082	2	.5	.5	78.3
	2083	1	.2	.2	78.5
	2085	3	.7	.7	79.2
	2086	2	.5	.5	79.6
	2087	1	.2	.2	79.9
	2088	1	.2	.2	80.1
	2089	2	.5	.5	80.5
	2091	2	.5	.5	81.0
	2092	2	.5	.5	81.4
	2093	2	.5	.5	81.9
	2095	1	.2	.2	82.1
	2096	1	.2	.2	82.4
	2097	1	.2	.2	82.6
	2098	1	.2	.2	82.8
	2099	2	.5	.5	83.3
	2100	3	.7	.7	83.9
	2101	1	.2	.2	84.2
	2102	1	.2	.2	84.4
	2103	3	.7	.7	85.1
	2104	1	.2	.2	85.3
	2105	2	.5	.5	85.7
	2106	1	.2	.2	86.0
	2107	1	.2	.2	86.2
	2108	2	.5	.5	86.7
	2109	1	.2	.2	86.9
	2110	1	.2	.2	87.1
	2112	1	.2	.2	87.3
	2116	2	.5	.5	87.8
	2117	2	.5	.5	88.2

PTCD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2118	1	.2	.2	88.5
	2119	1	.2	.2	88.7
	2120	1	.2	.2	88.9
	2121	1	.2	.2	89.1
	2122	1	.2	.2	89.4
	2124	1	.2	.2	89.6
	2125	1	.2	.2	89.8
	2126	2	.5	.5	90.3
	2127	1	.2	.2	90.5
	2129	2	.5	.5	91.0
	2130	1	.2	.2	91.2
	2132	1	.2	.2	91.4
	2133	1	.2	.2	91.6
	2134	3	.7	.7	92.3
	2135	3	.7	.7	93.0
	2136	3	.7	.7	93.7
	2137	2	.5	.5	94.1
	2138	3	.7	.7	94.8
	2139	2	.5	.5	95.2
	2141	3	.7	.7	95.9
	2142	1	.2	.2	96.2
	2143	1	.2	.2	96.4
	2144	1	.2	.2	96.6
	2145	2	.5	.5	97.1
	2146	3	.7	.7	97.7
	2147	1	.2	.2	98.0
	2148	2	.5	.5	98.4
	2151	1	.2	.2	98.6
	2152	2	.5	.5	99.1
	2153	2	.5	.5	99.5
	2154	1	.2	.2	99.8
	2155	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	442	100.0	100.0	

Frequencies

Statistics

		Case identification number	Q1	Q1AA	Q1AB	Q1B	Q2A	Q2B
N	Valid	203	202	148	104	40	195	194
	Missing	0	1	55	99	163	8	9

Statistics

		Q2C	Q2D	Q2E	Q2E1	Q3A	Q3B	Q3C
N	Valid	195	193	167	203	202	198	196
	Missing	8	10	36	0	1	5	7

Statistics

		Q4	Q5	Q6A	Q6B	Q6C	Q6D	Q6E
N	Valid	201	202	202	201	199	202	201
	Missing	2	1	1	2	4	1	2

Statistics

		Q7A	Q7B	Q7C	Q7D	Q7E	Q7AA	Q8
N	Valid	203	203	203	203	203	203	202
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Statistics

		Q8A	Q9A	Q9B	Q9C	Q9D	Q9E	Q9F
N	Valid	22	201	200	202	202	203	203
	Missing	181	2	3	1	1	0	0

Statistics

		Q9G	Q9H	Q9I	Q10	Q11	Q12A	Q12B
N	Valid	203	200	203	203	203	193	193
	Missing	0	3	0	0	0	10	10

Statistics

		Q12C	Q12D	Q12E	Q13	Q13A	Q14A	Q14B
N	Valid	190	190	191	193	183	194	194
	Missing	13	13	12	10	20	9	9

Statistics

		Q14C	Q14D	Q15A	Q15B	Q15C	Q15D	Q16
N	Valid	194	194	194	128	126	72	196
	Missing	9	9	9	75	77	131	7

Statistics

		Q17A	Q17B	Q17C	Q18	Q19A	Q19B	Q19C
N	Valid	203	160	116	203	199	199	199
	Missing	0	43	87	0	4	4	4

Statistics

		Q20	Q21	Q22	STCD	RTCD	SMPL
N	Valid	195	203	192	203	203	203
	Missing	8	0	11	0	0	0

Statistics

		MSA	DCOD
N	Valid	203	203
	Missing	0	0

Case identification number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1001	1	.5	.5	.5
	1002	1	.5	.5	1.0
	1003	1	.5	.5	1.5
	1004	1	.5	.5	2.0
	1005	1	.5	.5	2.5
	1006	1	.5	.5	3.0
	1007	1	.5	.5	3.4
	1008	1	.5	.5	3.9
	1009	1	.5	.5	4.4
	1010	1	.5	.5	4.9
	1011	1	.5	.5	5.4
	1013	1	.5	.5	5.9
	1014	1	.5	.5	6.4
	1015	1	.5	.5	6.9
	1017	1	.5	.5	7.4
	1019	1	.5	.5	7.9
	1021	1	.5	.5	8.4
	1023	1	.5	.5	8.9
	1024	1	.5	.5	9.4
	1025	1	.5	.5	9.9
	1026	1	.5	.5	10.3
	1027	1	.5	.5	10.8
	1028	1	.5	.5	11.3
	1030	1	.5	.5	11.8
	1031	1	.5	.5	12.3
	1034	1	.5	.5	12.8
	1035	1	.5	.5	13.3
	1036	1	.5	.5	13.8
	1037	1	.5	.5	14.3
	1038	1	.5	.5	14.8
	1039	1	.5	.5	15.3
	1041	1	.5	.5	15.8
	1043	1	.5	.5	16.3
	1044	1	.5	.5	16.7
	1045	1	.5	.5	17.2
	1046	1	.5	.5	17.7
	1048	1	.5	.5	18.2
	1050	1	.5	.5	18.7
	1051	1	.5	.5	19.2
	1052	1	.5	.5	19.7
	1054	1	.5	.5	20.2
	1056	1	.5	.5	20.7
	1057	1	.5	.5	21.2
	1058	1	.5	.5	21.7
	1062	1	.5	.5	22.2
	1064	1	.5	.5	22.7
	1065	1	.5	.5	23.2
	1066	1	.5	.5	23.6
	1067	1	.5	.5	24.1
	1068	1	.5	.5	24.6
	1069	1	.5	.5	25.1

Case identification number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1070	1	.5	.5	25.6
	1071	1	.5	.5	26.1
	1072	1	.5	.5	26.6
	1073	1	.5	.5	27.1
	1074	1	.5	.5	27.6
	1075	1	.5	.5	28.1
	1076	1	.5	.5	28.6
	1077	1	.5	.5	29.1
	1078	1	.5	.5	29.6
	1079	1	.5	.5	30.0
	1080	1	.5	.5	30.5
	1081	1	.5	.5	31.0
	1082	1	.5	.5	31.5
	1083	1	.5	.5	32.0
	1084	1	.5	.5	32.5
	1085	1	.5	.5	33.0
	1086	1	.5	.5	33.5
	1087	1	.5	.5	34.0
	1089	1	.5	.5	34.5
	1090	1	.5	.5	35.0
	1091	1	.5	.5	35.5
	1092	1	.5	.5	36.0
	1093	1	.5	.5	36.5
	1094	1	.5	.5	36.9
	1095	1	.5	.5	37.4
	1097	1	.5	.5	37.9
	1098	1	.5	.5	38.4
	1099	1	.5	.5	38.9
	1100	1	.5	.5	39.4
	1101	1	.5	.5	39.9
	1102	1	.5	.5	40.4
	1103	1	.5	.5	40.9
	1104	1	.5	.5	41.4
	1106	1	.5	.5	41.9
	1107	1	.5	.5	42.4
	1108	1	.5	.5	42.9
	1109	1	.5	.5	43.3
	1110	1	.5	.5	43.8
	1111	1	.5	.5	44.3
	1112	1	.5	.5	44.8
	1113	1	.5	.5	45.3
	1114	1	.5	.5	45.8
	1117	1	.5	.5	46.3
	1118	1	.5	.5	46.8
	1119	1	.5	.5	47.3
	1120	1	.5	.5	47.8
	1121	1	.5	.5	48.3
	1122	1	.5	.5	48.8
	1123	1	.5	.5	49.3
	1124	1	.5	.5	49.8
	1125	1	.5	.5	50.2

Case identification number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1126	1	.5	.5	50.7
	1127	1	.5	.5	51.2
	1128	1	.5	.5	51.7
	1129	1	.5	.5	52.2
	1130	1	.5	.5	52.7
	1131	1	.5	.5	53.2
	1132	1	.5	.5	53.7
	1134	1	.5	.5	54.2
	1135	1	.5	.5	54.7
	1136	1	.5	.5	55.2
	1137	1	.5	.5	55.7
	1138	1	.5	.5	56.2
	1139	1	.5	.5	56.7
	1140	2	1.0	1.0	57.6
	1141	1	.5	.5	58.1
	1142	1	.5	.5	58.6
	1144	1	.5	.5	59.1
	1145	1	.5	.5	59.6
	1146	1	.5	.5	60.1
	1147	1	.5	.5	60.6
	1149	1	.5	.5	61.1
	1150	1	.5	.5	61.6
	1151	1	.5	.5	62.1
	1152	1	.5	.5	62.6
	1153	1	.5	.5	63.1
	1154	1	.5	.5	63.5
	1155	1	.5	.5	64.0
	1156	1	.5	.5	64.5
	1157	1	.5	.5	65.0
	1158	1	.5	.5	65.5
	1160	1	.5	.5	66.0
	1161	1	.5	.5	66.5
	1162	1	.5	.5	67.0
	1163	1	.5	.5	67.5
	1164	1	.5	.5	68.0
	1166	1	.5	.5	68.5
	1167	1	.5	.5	69.0
	1168	1	.5	.5	69.5
	1169	1	.5	.5	70.0
	1170	1	.5	.5	70.4
	1171	1	.5	.5	70.9
	1172	1	.5	.5	71.4
	1173	1	.5	.5	71.9
	1174	1	.5	.5	72.4
	1175	1	.5	.5	72.9
	1176	1	.5	.5	73.4
	1177	1	.5	.5	73.9
	1178	1	.5	.5	74.4
	1179	1	.5	.5	74.9
	1180	1	.5	.5	75.4
	1181	1	.5	.5	75.9

Case identification number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1183	1	.5	.5	76.4
	1185	1	.5	.5	76.8
	1186	1	.5	.5	77.3
	1187	1	.5	.5	77.8
	1188	1	.5	.5	78.3
	1189	1	.5	.5	78.8
	1190	1	.5	.5	79.3
	1191	1	.5	.5	79.8
	1193	1	.5	.5	80.3
	1194	1	.5	.5	80.8
	1195	1	.5	.5	81.3
	1196	1	.5	.5	81.8
	1197	1	.5	.5	82.3
	1198	1	.5	.5	82.8
	1199	1	.5	.5	83.3
	1200	1	.5	.5	83.7
	1201	1	.5	.5	84.2
	1203	1	.5	.5	84.7
	1204	1	.5	.5	85.2
	1205	1	.5	.5	85.7
	1206	1	.5	.5	86.2
	1207	1	.5	.5	86.7
	1209	1	.5	.5	87.2
	1210	1	.5	.5	87.7
	1211	1	.5	.5	88.2
	1212	1	.5	.5	88.7
	1213	1	.5	.5	89.2
	1214	1	.5	.5	89.7
	1215	1	.5	.5	90.1
	1217	1	.5	.5	90.6
	1218	1	.5	.5	91.1
	1219	1	.5	.5	91.6
	1220	1	.5	.5	92.1
	1221	1	.5	.5	92.6
	1224	1	.5	.5	93.1
	1225	1	.5	.5	93.6
	1226	1	.5	.5	94.1
	1227	1	.5	.5	94.6
	1228	1	.5	.5	95.1
	1229	1	.5	.5	95.6
	1230	1	.5	.5	96.1
	1231	1	.5	.5	96.6
	1232	1	.5	.5	97.0
	1233	1	.5	.5	97.5
	1234	1	.5	.5	98.0
	1235	1	.5	.5	98.5
	1237	1	.5	.5	99.0
	1238	1	.5	.5	99.5
	1239	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes (Please answer question 1a.)(goto q1aa)	162	79.8	80.2	80.2
	no (Please answer question 1b.)(goto q1b)	40	19.7	19.8	100.0
	Total	202	99.5	100.0	
Missing	not answered (goto q2a)	1	.5		
Total		203	100.0		

Q1AA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero	10	4.9	6.8	6.8
	members	81	39.9	54.7	61.5
	2	31	15.3	20.9	82.4
	3	7	3.4	4.7	87.2
	4	4	2.0	2.7	89.9
	5	3	1.5	2.0	91.9
	6	2	1.0	1.4	93.2
	8	1	.5	.7	93.9
	9	1	.5	.7	94.6
	52	1	.5	.7	95.3
	can't estimate	7	3.4	4.7	100.0
	Total	148	72.9	100.0	
Missing	not answered	14	6.9		
	System	41	20.2		
	Total	55	27.1		
Total		203	100.0		

Q1AB

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero	44	21.7	42.3	42.3
	members	33	16.3	31.7	74.0
	2	10	4.9	9.6	83.7
	3	5	2.5	4.8	88.5
	4	2	1.0	1.9	90.4
	5	1	.5	1.0	91.3
	6	1	.5	1.0	92.3
	7	1	.5	1.0	93.3
	86	1	.5	1.0	94.2
	can't estimate	6	3.0	5.8	100.0
	Total	104	51.2	100.0	
Missing	not answered	58	28.6		
	System	41	20.2		
	Total	99	48.8		
Total		203	100.0		

Q1B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	39	19.2	97.5	97.5
	not answered	1	.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	40	19.7	100.0	
Missing	System	163	80.3		
Total		203	100.0		

Q2A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero percent	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	percent	5	2.5	2.6	3.6
	2	4	2.0	2.1	5.6
	5	17	8.4	8.7	14.4
	10	23	11.3	11.8	26.2
	15	3	1.5	1.5	27.7
	20	11	5.4	5.6	33.3
	25	5	2.5	2.6	35.9
	30	5	2.5	2.6	38.5
	33	1	.5	.5	39.0
	35	3	1.5	1.5	40.5
	40	11	5.4	5.6	46.2
	45	2	1.0	1.0	47.2
	50	26	12.8	13.3	60.5
	55	2	1.0	1.0	61.5
	60	12	5.9	6.2	67.7
	65	6	3.0	3.1	70.8
	70	21	10.3	10.8	81.5
	75	9	4.4	4.6	86.2
	77	1	.5	.5	86.7
	80	10	4.9	5.1	91.8
	84	1	.5	.5	92.3
	85	6	3.0	3.1	95.4
	86	1	.5	.5	95.9
	90	5	2.5	2.6	98.5
	95	2	1.0	1.0	99.5
	96	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	195	96.1	100.0	
Missing	don't know	1	.5		
	not answered	7	3.4		
	Total	8	3.9		
Total		203	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero percent	3	1.5	1.5	1.5
	percent	9	4.4	4.6	6.2
	2	14	6.9	7.2	13.4
	3	5	2.5	2.6	16.0
	4	2	1.0	1.0	17.0
	5	39	19.2	20.1	37.1
	8	1	.5	.5	37.6
	10	41	20.2	21.1	58.8
	13	2	1.0	1.0	59.8
	15	13	6.4	6.7	66.5
	18	1	.5	.5	67.0
	19	1	.5	.5	67.5
	20	29	14.3	14.9	82.5
	25	11	5.4	5.7	88.1
	30	11	5.4	5.7	93.8
	33	1	.5	.5	94.3
	40	4	2.0	2.1	96.4
	43	1	.5	.5	96.9
	47	1	.5	.5	97.4
	60	1	.5	.5	97.9
	65	1	.5	.5	98.5
	70	1	.5	.5	99.0
	75	1	.5	.5	99.5
	80	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	194	95.6	100.0	
Missing	don't know	1	.5		
	not answered	8	3.9		
	Total	9	4.4		
Total		203	100.0		

Q2C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero percent	27	13.3	13.8	13.8
	percent	53	26.1	27.2	41.0
	2	22	10.8	11.3	52.3
	3	5	2.5	2.6	54.9
	4	1	.5	.5	55.4
	5	55	27.1	28.2	83.6
	10	21	10.3	10.8	94.4
	15	1	.5	.5	94.9
	20	3	1.5	1.5	96.4
	25	2	1.0	1.0	97.4
	30	3	1.5	1.5	99.0
	35	1	.5	.5	99.5
	75	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	195	96.1	100.0	
Missing	don't know	1	.5		
	not answered	7	3.4		
	Total	8	3.9		
Total		203	100.0		

Q2D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero percent	16	7.9	8.3	8.3
	percent	37	18.2	19.2	27.5
	2	29	14.3	15.0	42.5
	3	5	2.5	2.6	45.1
	5	56	27.6	29.0	74.1
	8	1	.5	.5	74.6
	9	1	.5	.5	75.1
	10	30	14.8	15.5	90.7
	15	6	3.0	3.1	93.8
	18	1	.5	.5	94.3
	20	7	3.4	3.6	97.9
	25	2	1.0	1.0	99.0
	30	2	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	193	95.1	100.0	
Missing	don't know	1	.5		
	not answered	9	4.4		
	Total	10	4.9		
Total		203	100.0		

Q2E

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero percent	32	15.8	19.2	19.2
	percent	4	2.0	2.4	21.6
	2	9	4.4	5.4	26.9
	3	4	2.0	2.4	29.3
	4	3	1.5	1.8	31.1
	5	30	14.8	18.0	49.1
	6	1	.5	.6	49.7
	7	1	.5	.6	50.3
	9	3	1.5	1.8	52.1
	10	23	11.3	13.8	65.9
	12	2	1.0	1.2	67.1
	14	2	1.0	1.2	68.3
	15	10	4.9	6.0	74.3
	18	1	.5	.6	74.9
	20	10	4.9	6.0	80.8
	21	2	1.0	1.2	82.0
	24	2	1.0	1.2	83.2
	25	10	4.9	6.0	89.2
	28	1	.5	.6	89.8
	30	4	2.0	2.4	92.2
	35	3	1.5	1.8	94.0
	36	1	.5	.6	94.6
	45	3	1.5	1.8	96.4
	50	2	1.0	1.2	97.6
	58	1	.5	.6	98.2
	86	2	1.0	1.2	99.4
	90	1	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	167	82.3	100.0	
Missing	don't know	1	.5		
	not answered	35	17.2		
	Total	36	17.7		
Total		203	100.0		

Q2E1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	119	58.6	58.6	58.6
	not answered	84	41.4	41.4	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q3A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero	1	.5	.5	.5
	newspapers	35	17.2	17.3	17.8
	2	73	36.0	36.1	54.0
	3	36	17.7	17.8	71.8
	4	21	10.3	10.4	82.2
	5	20	9.9	9.9	92.1
	6	5	2.5	2.5	94.6
	7	2	1.0	1.0	95.5
	8	1	.5	.5	96.0
	9	2	1.0	1.0	97.0
	15	1	.5	.5	97.5
	20	1	.5	.5	98.0
	35	1	.5	.5	98.5
	48	1	.5	.5	99.0
	50	1	.5	.5	99.5
	70	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	202	99.5	100.0	
Missing	not answered	1	.5		
Total		203	100.0		

Q3B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero	8	3.9	4.0	4.0
	Television stations	12	5.9	6.1	10.1
	2	16	7.9	8.1	18.2
	3	55	27.1	27.8	46.0
	4	50	24.6	25.3	71.2
	5	23	11.3	11.6	82.8
	6	10	4.9	5.1	87.9
	7	11	5.4	5.6	93.4
	8	6	3.0	3.0	96.5
	9	2	1.0	1.0	97.5
	10	1	.5	.5	98.0
	25	2	1.0	1.0	99.0
	50	1	.5	.5	99.5
	70	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	198	97.5	100.0	
Missing	not answered	5	2.5		
Total		203	100.0		

Q3C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero	14	6.9	7.1	7.1
	radio stations	24	11.8	12.2	19.4
	2	35	17.2	17.9	37.2
	3	44	21.7	22.4	59.7
	4	32	15.8	16.3	76.0
	5	16	7.9	8.2	84.2
	6	9	4.4	4.6	88.8
	7	2	1.0	1.0	89.8
	8	4	2.0	2.0	91.8
	9	1	.5	.5	92.3
	10	8	3.9	4.1	96.4
	12	1	.5	.5	96.9
	13	1	.5	.5	97.4
	15	2	1.0	1.0	98.5
	16	2	1.0	1.0	99.5
	70	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	196	96.6	100.0	
Missing	not answered	7	3.4		
Total		203	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero	1	.5	.5	.5
	reporters	1	.5	.5	1.0
	2	10	4.9	5.0	6.0
	3	6	3.0	3.0	9.0
	4	7	3.4	3.5	12.4
	5	21	10.3	10.4	22.9
	6	9	4.4	4.5	27.4
	7	5	2.5	2.5	29.9
	8	12	5.9	6.0	35.8
	9	7	3.4	3.5	39.3
	10	15	7.4	7.5	46.8
	11	2	1.0	1.0	47.8
	12	11	5.4	5.5	53.2
	13	6	3.0	3.0	56.2
	14	1	.5	.5	56.7
	15	22	10.8	10.9	67.7
	16	3	1.5	1.5	69.2
	17	1	.5	.5	69.7
	18	6	3.0	3.0	72.6
	19	1	.5	.5	73.1
	20	15	7.4	7.5	80.6
	21	1	.5	.5	81.1
	22	1	.5	.5	81.6
	24	2	1.0	1.0	82.6
	25	9	4.4	4.5	87.1
	28	1	.5	.5	87.6
	29	1	.5	.5	88.1
	30	9	4.4	4.5	92.5
	32	1	.5	.5	93.0
	35	1	.5	.5	93.5
	38	2	1.0	1.0	94.5
	40	2	1.0	1.0	95.5
	50	3	1.5	1.5	97.0
	75	3	1.5	1.5	98.5
	can't estimate	3	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	201	99.0	100.0	
Missing	not answered	2	1.0		
Total		203	100.0		

Q5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than once a month	7	3.4	3.5	3.5
	monthly	14	6.9	6.9	10.4
	weekly	56	27.6	27.7	38.1
	daily	81	39.9	40.1	78.2
	several times a day	39	19.2	19.3	97.5
	two responses circled (specify)	5	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	202	99.5	100.0	
Missing	not answered	1	.5		
Total		203	100.0		

Q6A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	never	18	8.9	8.9	8.9
	less than once a month	90	44.3	44.6	53.5
	monthly	57	28.1	28.2	81.7
	weekly	33	16.3	16.3	98.0
	daily	4	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	202	99.5	100.0	
Missing	not answered	1	.5		
Total		203	100.0		

Q6B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	never	4	2.0	2.0	2.0
	less than once a month	50	24.6	24.9	26.9
	monthly	51	25.1	25.4	52.2
	weekly	78	38.4	38.8	91.0
	daily	18	8.9	9.0	100.0
	Total	201	99.0	100.0	
Missing	not answered	2	1.0		
Total		203	100.0		

Q6C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	never	1	.5	.5	.5
	less than once a month	28	13.8	14.1	14.6
	monthly	54	26.6	27.1	41.7
	weekly	89	43.8	44.7	86.4
	daily	27	13.3	13.6	100.0
	Total	199	98.0	100.0	
Missing	not answered	4	2.0		
Total		203	100.0		

Q6D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than once a month	5	2.5	2.5	2.5
	monthly	34	16.7	16.8	19.3
	weekly	86	42.4	42.6	61.9
	daily	77	37.9	38.1	100.0
	Total	202	99.5	100.0	
Missing	not answered	1	.5		
Total		203	100.0		

Q6E

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	never	33	16.3	16.4	16.4
	less than once a month	138	68.0	68.7	85.1
	monthly	26	12.8	12.9	98.0
	weekly	3	1.5	1.5	99.5
	daily	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	201	99.0	100.0	
Missing	not answered	2	1.0		
Total		203	100.0		

Q7A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	81	39.9	39.9	39.9
	not answered	122	60.1	60.1	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q7B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	85	41.9	41.9	41.9
	not answered	118	58.1	58.1	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q7C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	51	25.1	25.1	25.1
	not answered	152	74.9	74.9	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q7D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	not answered	201	99.0	99.0	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q7E

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	21	10.3	10.3	10.3
	not answered	182	89.7	89.7	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q7AA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	195	96.1	96.1	96.1
	not answered	8	3.9	3.9	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q8

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes (Please answer question 8a.)(goto q8a)	22	10.8	10.9	10.9
	no (Please go to question 9.)	180	88.7	89.1	100.0
	Total	202	99.5	100.0	
Missing	not answered	1	.5		
Total		203	100.0		

Q8A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	22	10.8	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	181	89.2		
Total		203	100.0		

Q9A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	3	1.5	1.5	1.5
	2	5	2.5	2.5	4.0
	3	31	15.3	15.4	19.4
	4	69	34.0	34.3	53.7
	strongly agree	93	45.8	46.3	100.0
	Total	201	99.0	100.0	
Missing	not answered	2	1.0		
Total		203	100.0		

Q9B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	3	1.5	1.5	1.5
	2	3	1.5	1.5	3.0
	3	17	8.4	8.5	11.5
	4	68	33.5	34.0	45.5
	strongly agree	109	53.7	54.5	100.0
	Total	200	98.5	100.0	
Missing	don't know	2	1.0		
	not answered	1	.5		
	Total	3	1.5		
Total		203	100.0		

Q9C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	6	3.0	3.0	3.0
	2	17	8.4	8.4	11.4
	3	31	15.3	15.3	26.7
	4	83	40.9	41.1	67.8
	strongly agree	65	32.0	32.2	100.0
	Total	202	99.5	100.0	
Missing	don't know	1	.5		
Total		203	100.0		

Q9D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	11	5.4	5.4	5.4
	2	42	20.7	20.8	26.2
	3	45	22.2	22.3	48.5
	4	48	23.6	23.8	72.3
	strongly agree	56	27.6	27.7	100.0
	Total	202	99.5	100.0	
Missing	not answered	1	.5		
Total		203	100.0		

Q9E

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	4	2.0	2.0	2.0
	2	2	1.0	1.0	3.0
	3	6	3.0	3.0	5.9
	4	28	13.8	13.8	19.7
	strongly agree	163	80.3	80.3	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q9F

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	6	3.0	3.0	3.0
	2	1	.5	.5	3.4
	3	9	4.4	4.4	7.9
	4	36	17.7	17.7	25.6
	strongly agree	151	74.4	74.4	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q9G

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	4	2.0	2.0	2.0
	2	7	3.4	3.4	5.4
	3	11	5.4	5.4	10.8
	4	75	36.9	36.9	47.8
	strongly agree	106	52.2	52.2	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q9H

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	11	5.4	5.5	5.5
	2	28	13.8	14.0	19.5
	3	48	23.6	24.0	43.5
	4	66	32.5	33.0	76.5
	strongly agree	47	23.2	23.5	100.0
	Total	200	98.5	100.0	
Missing	don't know	3	1.5		
Total		203	100.0		

Q9I

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	11	5.4	5.4	5.4
	2	23	11.3	11.3	16.7
	3	84	41.4	41.4	58.1
	4	49	24.1	24.1	82.3
	strongly agree	36	17.7	17.7	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q10

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	177	87.2	87.2	87.2
	not answered	26	12.8	12.8	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q11

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes (Please answer question 12.)(goto q12a)	194	95.6	95.6	95.6
	no (Please go to question 16 on page 6.)	9	4.4	4.4	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q12A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	3	1.5	1.6	1.6
	2	12	5.9	6.2	7.8
	3	18	8.9	9.3	17.1
	4	38	18.7	19.7	36.8
	strongly agree	122	60.1	63.2	100.0
	Total	193	95.1	100.0	
Missing	not answered	1	.5		
	System	9	4.4		
	Total	10	4.9		
Total		203	100.0		

Q12B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	4	2.0	2.1	2.1
	2	9	4.4	4.7	6.7
	3	26	12.8	13.5	20.2
	4	70	34.5	36.3	56.5
	strongly agree	84	41.4	43.5	100.0
	Total	193	95.1	100.0	
Missing	not answered	1	.5		
	System	9	4.4		
	Total	10	4.9		
Total		203	100.0		

Q12C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	58	28.6	30.5	30.5
	2	43	21.2	22.6	53.2
	3	38	18.7	20.0	73.2
	4	36	17.7	18.9	92.1
	strongly agree	15	7.4	7.9	100.0
	Total	190	93.6	100.0	
Missing	don't know	1	.5		
	not answered	3	1.5		
	System	9	4.4		
	Total	13	6.4		
Total		203	100.0		

Q12D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	12	5.9	6.3	6.3
	2	28	13.8	14.7	21.1
	3	50	24.6	26.3	47.4
	4	64	31.5	33.7	81.1
	strongly agree	36	17.7	18.9	100.0
	Total	190	93.6	100.0	
Missing	don't know	3	1.5		
	not answered	1	.5		
	System	9	4.4		
	Total	13	6.4		
Total		203	100.0		

Q12E

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	4	2.0	2.1	2.1
	2	4	2.0	2.1	4.2
	3	16	7.9	8.4	12.6
	4	41	20.2	21.5	34.0
	strongly agree	126	62.1	66.0	100.0
	Total	191	94.1	100.0	
Missing	don't know	2	1.0		
	not answered	1	.5		
	System	9	4.4		
	Total	12	5.9		
Total		203	100.0		

Q13

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes (Please answer question 13a.)(goto q13a)	183	90.1	94.8	94.8
	no (Please go to question 14.)	10	4.9	5.2	100.0
	Total	193	95.1	100.0	
Missing	not answered	1	.5		
	System	9	4.4		
	Total	10	4.9		
Total		203	100.0		

Q13A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	179	88.2	97.8	97.8
	not answered	4	2.0	2.2	100.0
	Total	183	90.1	100.0	
Missing	System	20	9.9		
Total		203	100.0		

Q14A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	80	39.4	41.2	41.2
	not answered	114	56.2	58.8	100.0
	Total	194	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	4.4		
Total		203	100.0		

Q14B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	81	39.9	41.8	41.8
	not answered	113	55.7	58.2	100.0
	Total	194	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	4.4		
Total		203	100.0		

Q14C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered	3	1.5	1.5	1.5
	not answered	191	94.1	98.5	100.0
	Total	194	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	4.4		
Total		203	100.0		

Q14D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (please specify)	40	19.7	20.6	20.6
	not answered	154	75.9	79.4	100.0
	Total	194	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	4.4		
Total		203	100.0		

Q15A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	128	63.1	66.0	66.0
	none (goto q16)	58	28.6	29.9	95.9
	not answered(goto q16)	8	3.9	4.1	100.0
	Total	194	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System	9	4.4		
Total		203	100.0		

Q15B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	76	37.4	59.4	59.4
	none	1	.5	.8	60.2
	not answered	51	25.1	39.8	100.0
	Total	128	63.1	100.0	
Missing	System	75	36.9		
Total		203	100.0		

Page 23

Q15C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than once a month	8	3.9	6.3	6.3
	monthly	21	10.3	16.7	23.0
	weekly	50	24.6	39.7	62.7
	daily	47	23.2	37.3	100.0
	Total	126	62.1	100.0	
Missing	not answered	2	1.0		
	System	75	36.9		
	Total	77	37.9		
Total		203	100.0		

Q15D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than once a month	2	1.0	2.8	2.8
	monthly	12	5.9	16.7	19.4
	weekly	28	13.8	38.9	58.3
	daily	28	13.8	38.9	97.2
	two responses circled (specify)	2	1.0	2.8	100.0
	Total	72	35.5	100.0	
Missing	not answered	4	2.0		
	System	127	62.6		
	Total	131	64.5		
Total		203	100.0		

Q16

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero percent	1	.5	.5	.5
	2	1	.5	.5	1.0
	5	9	4.4	4.6	5.6
	8	1	.5	.5	6.1
	10	7	3.4	3.6	9.7
	13	1	.5	.5	10.2
	15	2	1.0	1.0	11.2
	18	1	.5	.5	11.7
	20	4	2.0	2.0	13.8
	25	8	3.9	4.1	17.9
	30	5	2.5	2.6	20.4
	40	2	1.0	1.0	21.4
	50	17	8.4	8.7	30.1
	60	8	3.9	4.1	34.2
	65	3	1.5	1.5	35.7
	70	5	2.5	2.6	38.3
	75	22	10.8	11.2	49.5
	80	17	8.4	8.7	58.2
	85	8	3.9	4.1	62.2
	89	1	.5	.5	62.8
	90	36	17.7	18.4	81.1
	92	1	.5	.5	81.6
	95	14	6.9	7.1	88.8
	98	2	1.0	1.0	89.8
	percent	2	1.0	1.0	90.8
	percent	18	8.9	9.2	100.0
	Total	196	96.6	100.0	
Missing	don't know	2	1.0		
	not answered	5	2.5		
	Total	7	3.4		
Total		203	100.0		

Q17A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	160	78.8	78.8	78.8
	not answered(goto q18)	43	21.2	21.2	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q17B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	116	57.1	72.5	72.5
	not answered(goto q18)	44	21.7	27.5	100.0
	Total	160	78.8	100.0	
Missing	System	43	21.2		
Total		203	100.0		

Q17C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	96	47.3	82.8	82.8
	not answered	20	9.9	17.2	100.0
	Total	116	57.1	100.0	
Missing	System	87	42.9		
Total		203	100.0		

Q18

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	answered (specify)	201	99.0	99.0	99.0
	not answered	2	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q19A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero	34	16.7	17.1	17.1
	years	37	18.2	18.6	35.7
	2	40	19.7	20.1	55.8
	3	17	8.4	8.5	64.3
	4	14	6.9	7.0	71.4
	5	16	7.9	8.0	79.4
	6	6	3.0	3.0	82.4
	7	8	3.9	4.0	86.4
	8	5	2.5	2.5	88.9
	9	3	1.5	1.5	90.5
	10	8	3.9	4.0	94.5
	11	4	2.0	2.0	96.5
	12	1	.5	.5	97.0
	13	1	.5	.5	97.5
	19	1	.5	.5	98.0
	20	1	.5	.5	98.5
	23	1	.5	.5	99.0
	26	1	.5	.5	99.5
	can't estimate	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	199	98.0	100.0	
Missing	not answered	4	2.0		
Total		203	100.0		

Q19B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero	64	31.5	32.2	32.2
	months	8	3.9	4.0	36.2
	2	16	7.9	8.0	44.2
	3	15	7.4	7.5	51.8
	4	18	8.9	9.0	60.8
	5	13	6.4	6.5	67.3
	6	27	13.3	13.6	80.9
	7	6	3.0	3.0	83.9
	8	8	3.9	4.0	87.9
	9	6	3.0	3.0	91.0
	10	13	6.4	6.5	97.5
	11	4	2.0	2.0	99.5
	can't estimate	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	199	98.0	100.0	
Missing	not answered	4	2.0		
Total		203	100.0		

Q19C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero	14	6.9	7.0	7.0
	years	46	22.7	23.1	30.2
	2	39	19.2	19.6	49.7
	3	26	12.8	13.1	62.8
	4	13	6.4	6.5	69.3
	5	19	9.4	9.5	78.9
	6	4	2.0	2.0	80.9
	7	9	4.4	4.5	85.4
	8	5	2.5	2.5	87.9
	9	3	1.5	1.5	89.4
	10	8	3.9	4.0	93.5
	11	4	2.0	2.0	95.5
	12	2	1.0	1.0	96.5
	13	2	1.0	1.0	97.5
	19	1	.5	.5	98.0
	20	1	.5	.5	98.5
	23	1	.5	.5	99.0
	26	1	.5	.5	99.5
	can't estimate	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	199	98.0	100.0	
Missing	not answered	4	2.0		
Total		203	100.0		

Page 27

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	police chief/commissioner	10	4.9	5.1	5.1
	assistant to chief/deputy chief/deputy commissione	9	4.4	4.6	9.7
	captain	13	6.4	6.7	16.4
	lieutenant	47	23.2	24.1	40.5
	sergeant	46	22.7	23.6	64.1
	patrol officer	26	12.8	13.3	77.4
	public information officer	2	1.0	1.0	78.5
	other (specify)	13	6.4	6.7	85.1
	civilian	21	10.3	10.8	95.9
	detective	8	3.9	4.1	100.0
	Total	195	96.1	100.0	
Missing	not answered	8	3.9		
Total		203	100.0		

Q21

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	zero	29	14.3	14.3	14.3
	2	3	1.5	1.5	15.8
	3	1	.5	.5	16.3
	4	5	2.5	2.5	18.7
	5	1	.5	.5	19.2
	8	7	3.4	3.4	22.7
	10	5	2.5	2.5	25.1
	12	2	1.0	1.0	26.1
	16	8	3.9	3.9	30.0
	20	5	2.5	2.5	32.5
	22	1	.5	.5	33.0
	24	12	5.9	5.9	38.9
	25	1	.5	.5	39.4
	30	3	1.5	1.5	40.9
	32	6	3.0	3.0	43.8
	40	37	18.2	18.2	62.1
	48	3	1.5	1.5	63.5
	50	5	2.5	2.5	66.0
	56	1	.5	.5	66.5
	60	6	3.0	3.0	69.5
	70	2	1.0	1.0	70.4
	80	12	5.9	5.9	76.4
	100	5	2.5	2.5	78.8
	110	1	.5	.5	79.3
	120	7	3.4	3.4	82.8
	150	4	2.0	2.0	84.7
	160	3	1.5	1.5	86.2
	180	1	.5	.5	86.7
	200	2	1.0	1.0	87.7
	224	1	.5	.5	88.2
	250	1	.5	.5	88.7
	300	2	1.0	1.0	89.7
	350	1	.5	.5	90.1
	997	10	4.9	4.9	95.1
	998	1	.5	.5	95.6
	999	9	4.4	4.4	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

Q22

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	more than adequate	25	12.3	13.0	13.0
	about right	59	29.1	30.7	43.8
	not enough	108	53.2	56.3	100.0
	Total	192	94.6	100.0	
Missing	not answered	11	5.4		
Total		203	100.0		

Page 29

STCD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Alabama	4	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Alaska	1	.5	.5	2.5
	Arizona	8	3.9	3.9	6.4
	Arkansas	1	.5	.5	6.9
	California	39	19.2	19.2	26.1
	Colorado	5	2.5	2.5	28.6
	Connecticut	4	2.0	2.0	30.5
	Florida	13	6.4	6.4	36.9
	Georgia	1	.5	.5	37.4
	Hawaii	3	1.5	1.5	38.9
	Idaho	1	.5	.5	39.4
	Illinois	5	2.5	2.5	41.9
	Indiana	4	2.0	2.0	43.8
	Iowa	2	1.0	1.0	44.8
	Kansas	4	2.0	2.0	46.8
	Kentucky	2	1.0	1.0	47.8
	Louisiana	3	1.5	1.5	49.3
	Maryland	1	.5	.5	49.8
	Massachusetts	6	3.0	3.0	52.7
	Michigan	7	3.4	3.4	56.2
	Minnesota	2	1.0	1.0	57.1
	Mississippi	1	.5	.5	57.6
	Missouri	4	2.0	2.0	59.6
	Nebraska	2	1.0	1.0	60.6
	Nevada	2	1.0	1.0	61.6
	New Hampshire	1	.5	.5	62.1
	New Jersey	3	1.5	1.5	63.5
	New Mexico	1	.5	.5	64.0
	New York	7	3.4	3.4	67.5
	North Carolina	4	2.0	2.0	69.5
	Ohio	6	3.0	3.0	72.4
	Oklahoma	2	1.0	1.0	73.4
	Oregon	3	1.5	1.5	74.9
	Pennsylvania	3	1.5	1.5	76.4
	Rhode Island	1	.5	.5	76.8
	South Carolina	1	.5	.5	77.3
	Tennessee	4	2.0	2.0	79.3
	Texas	21	10.3	10.3	89.7
	Utah	2	1.0	1.0	90.6
	Virginia	13	6.4	6.4	97.0
	Washington	3	1.5	1.5	98.5
	Wisconsin	3	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

RTCD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Returned after 1st mailing but before postcard	130	64.0	64.0	64.0
	Returned after postcard but before 2nd mailing	31	15.3	15.3	79.3
	Returned after 2nd mailing	42	20.7	20.7	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

SMPL

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Police Information Officer	203	100.0	100.0	100.0

MSA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Code 1	1	.5	.5	.5
	40	1	.5	.5	1.0
	80	1	.5	.5	1.5
	160	1	.5	.5	2.0
	200	1	.5	.5	2.5
	240	1	.5	.5	3.0
	320	1	.5	.5	3.4
	380	1	.5	.5	3.9
	440	1	.5	.5	4.4
	640	1	.5	.5	4.9
	680	1	.5	.5	5.4
	720	1	.5	.5	5.9
	760	1	.5	.5	6.4
	840	1	.5	.5	6.9
	1000	1	.5	.5	7.4
	1080	1	.5	.5	7.9
	1123	6	3.0	3.0	10.8
	1240	1	.5	.5	11.3
	1280	3	1.5	1.5	12.8
	1360	1	.5	.5	13.3
	1520	1	.5	.5	13.8
	1560	1	.5	.5	14.3
	1600	2	1.0	1.0	15.3
	1640	1	.5	.5	15.8
	1680	1	.5	.5	16.3
	1720	1	.5	.5	16.7
	1760	1	.5	.5	17.2
	1800	1	.5	.5	17.7
	1840	1	.5	.5	18.2
	1880	1	.5	.5	18.7
	1920	6	3.0	3.0	21.7
	2000	1	.5	.5	22.2
	2080	3	1.5	1.5	23.6
	2120	1	.5	.5	24.1

MSA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2160	4	2.0	2.0	26.1
	2320	1	.5	.5	26.6
	2400	1	.5	.5	27.1
	2440	1	.5	.5	27.6
	2560	1	.5	.5	28.1
	2680	2	1.0	1.0	29.1
	2760	1	.5	.5	29.6
	2800	2	1.0	1.0	30.5
	2840	1	.5	.5	31.0
	2900	1	.5	.5	31.5
	3000	1	.5	.5	32.0
	3080	1	.5	.5	32.5
	3120	1	.5	.5	33.0
	3283	1	.5	.5	33.5
	3320	3	1.5	1.5	35.0
	3360	1	.5	.5	35.5
	3440	1	.5	.5	36.0
	3480	1	.5	.5	36.5
	3560	1	.5	.5	36.9
	3600	1	.5	.5	37.4
	3760	4	2.0	2.0	39.4
	3840	1	.5	.5	39.9
	4040	1	.5	.5	40.4
	4080	1	.5	.5	40.9
	4120	2	1.0	1.0	41.9
	4280	1	.5	.5	42.4
	4360	1	.5	.5	42.9
	4400	1	.5	.5	43.3
	4480	9	4.4	4.4	47.8
	4520	1	.5	.5	48.3
	4720	1	.5	.5	48.8
	4880	1	.5	.5	49.3
	4920	1	.5	.5	49.8
	5000	4	2.0	2.0	51.7
	5080	1	.5	.5	52.2
	5120	2	1.0	1.0	53.2
	5160	1	.5	.5	53.7
	5170	1	.5	.5	54.2
	5240	1	.5	.5	54.7
	5360	1	.5	.5	55.2
	5483	3	1.5	1.5	56.7
	5560	1	.5	.5	57.1
	5600	2	1.0	1.0	58.1
	5640	2	1.0	1.0	59.1
	5720	8	3.9	3.9	63.1
	5775	3	1.5	1.5	64.5
	5880	1	.5	.5	65.0
	5920	1	.5	.5	65.5
	5945	6	3.0	3.0	68.5
	5960	1	.5	.5	69.0
	6120	1	.5	.5	69.5

MSA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	6160	1	.5	.5	70.0
	6200	5	2.5	2.5	72.4
	6280	1	.5	.5	72.9
	6440	2	1.0	1.0	73.9
	6483	1	.5	.5	74.4
	6560	1	.5	.5	74.9
	6640	1	.5	.5	75.4
	6760	2	1.0	1.0	76.4
	6780	5	2.5	2.5	78.8
	6840	2	1.0	1.0	79.8
	6880	1	.5	.5	80.3
	6920	1	.5	.5	80.8
	7040	1	.5	.5	81.3
	7080	1	.5	.5	81.8
	7120	1	.5	.5	82.3
	7160	2	1.0	1.0	83.3
	7240	1	.5	.5	83.7
	7320	4	2.0	2.0	85.7
	7360	1	.5	.5	86.2
	7400	1	.5	.5	86.7
	7500	1	.5	.5	87.2
	7600	1	.5	.5	87.7
	7680	1	.5	.5	88.2
	7800	1	.5	.5	88.7
	7840	1	.5	.5	89.2
	7920	3	1.5	1.5	90.6
	8120	1	.5	.5	91.1
	8240	1	.5	.5	91.6
	8280	3	1.5	1.5	93.1
	8400	1	.5	.5	93.6
	8440	1	.5	.5	94.1
	8520	1	.5	.5	94.6
	8560	1	.5	.5	95.1
	8720	1	.5	.5	95.6
	8735	3	1.5	1.5	97.0
	8780	1	.5	.5	97.5
	8840	3	1.5	1.5	99.0
	9040	1	.5	.5	99.5
	9080	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

DCOD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Code	1	.5	.5	.5
	2	1	.5	.5	1.0
	3	1	.5	.5	1.5
	4	1	.5	.5	2.0
	5	1	.5	.5	2.5
	6	1	.5	.5	3.0

DCOD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	7	1	.5	.5	3.4
	8	1	.5	.5	3.9
	9	1	.5	.5	4.4
	10	1	.5	.5	4.9
	11	1	.5	.5	5.4
	13	1	.5	.5	5.9
	14	1	.5	.5	6.4
	15	1	.5	.5	6.9
	17	1	.5	.5	7.4
	19	1	.5	.5	7.9
	21	1	.5	.5	8.4
	23	1	.5	.5	8.9
	24	1	.5	.5	9.4
	25	1	.5	.5	9.9
	26	1	.5	.5	10.3
	27	1	.5	.5	10.8
	28	1	.5	.5	11.3
	30	1	.5	.5	11.8
	31	1	.5	.5	12.3
	34	1	.5	.5	12.8
	35	1	.5	.5	13.3
	36	1	.5	.5	13.8
	37	1	.5	.5	14.3
	38	1	.5	.5	14.8
	39	1	.5	.5	15.3
	41	1	.5	.5	15.8
	43	1	.5	.5	16.3
	44	1	.5	.5	16.7
	45	1	.5	.5	17.2
	46	1	.5	.5	17.7
	48	1	.5	.5	18.2
	50	1	.5	.5	18.7
	51	1	.5	.5	19.2
	52	1	.5	.5	19.7
	54	1	.5	.5	20.2
	56	1	.5	.5	20.7
	57	1	.5	.5	21.2
	58	1	.5	.5	21.7
	62	1	.5	.5	22.2
	64	1	.5	.5	22.7
	65	1	.5	.5	23.2
	66	1	.5	.5	23.6
	67	1	.5	.5	24.1
	68	1	.5	.5	24.6
	69	1	.5	.5	25.1
	70	1	.5	.5	25.6
	71	1	.5	.5	26.1
	72	1	.5	.5	26.6
	73	1	.5	.5	27.1
	74	1	.5	.5	27.6
	75	1	.5	.5	28.1

DCOD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	76	1	.5	.5	28.6
	77	1	.5	.5	29.1
	78	1	.5	.5	29.6
	79	1	.5	.5	30.0
	80	1	.5	.5	30.5
	81	1	.5	.5	31.0
	82	1	.5	.5	31.5
	83	1	.5	.5	32.0
	84	1	.5	.5	32.5
	85	1	.5	.5	33.0
	86	1	.5	.5	33.5
	87	1	.5	.5	34.0
	88	1	.5	.5	34.5
	89	1	.5	.5	35.0
	90	1	.5	.5	35.5
	91	1	.5	.5	36.0
	92	1	.5	.5	36.5
	93	1	.5	.5	36.9
	94	1	.5	.5	37.4
	96	1	.5	.5	37.9
	97	1	.5	.5	38.4
	98	1	.5	.5	38.9
	99	1	.5	.5	39.4
	100	1	.5	.5	39.9
	101	1	.5	.5	40.4
	102	1	.5	.5	40.9
	103	1	.5	.5	41.4
	105	1	.5	.5	41.9
	106	1	.5	.5	42.4
	107	1	.5	.5	42.9
	108	1	.5	.5	43.3
	109	1	.5	.5	43.8
	110	1	.5	.5	44.3
	111	1	.5	.5	44.8
	112	1	.5	.5	45.3
	113	1	.5	.5	45.8
	116	1	.5	.5	46.3
	117	1	.5	.5	46.8
	118	1	.5	.5	47.3
	119	1	.5	.5	47.8
	120	1	.5	.5	48.3
	121	1	.5	.5	48.8
	122	1	.5	.5	49.3
	123	1	.5	.5	49.8
	124	1	.5	.5	50.2
	125	1	.5	.5	50.7
	126	1	.5	.5	51.2
	127	1	.5	.5	51.7
	128	1	.5	.5	52.2
	129	1	.5	.5	52.7
	130	1	.5	.5	53.2

DCOD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	131	1	.5	.5	53.7
	133	1	.5	.5	54.2
	134	1	.5	.5	54.7
	135	1	.5	.5	55.2
	136	1	.5	.5	55.7
	137	1	.5	.5	56.2
	138	1	.5	.5	56.7
	139	1	.5	.5	57.1
	140	1	.5	.5	57.6
	141	1	.5	.5	58.1
	143	1	.5	.5	58.6
	144	1	.5	.5	59.1
	145	1	.5	.5	59.6
	146	1	.5	.5	60.1
	148	1	.5	.5	60.6
	149	1	.5	.5	61.1
	150	1	.5	.5	61.6
	151	1	.5	.5	62.1
	152	1	.5	.5	62.6
	153	1	.5	.5	63.1
	154	1	.5	.5	63.5
	155	1	.5	.5	64.0
	156	1	.5	.5	64.5
	157	1	.5	.5	65.0
	159	1	.5	.5	65.5
	160	1	.5	.5	66.0
	161	1	.5	.5	66.5
	162	1	.5	.5	67.0
	163	1	.5	.5	67.5
	165	1	.5	.5	68.0
	166	1	.5	.5	68.5
	167	1	.5	.5	69.0
	168	1	.5	.5	69.5
	169	1	.5	.5	70.0
	170	1	.5	.5	70.4
	171	1	.5	.5	70.9
	172	1	.5	.5	71.4
	173	1	.5	.5	71.9
	174	1	.5	.5	72.4
	175	1	.5	.5	72.9
	176	1	.5	.5	73.4
	177	1	.5	.5	73.9
	178	1	.5	.5	74.4
	179	1	.5	.5	74.9
	180	1	.5	.5	75.4
	182	1	.5	.5	75.9
	184	1	.5	.5	76.4
	185	1	.5	.5	76.8
	186	1	.5	.5	77.3
	187	1	.5	.5	77.8
	188	1	.5	.5	78.3

DCOD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	189	1	.5	.5	78.8
	190	1	.5	.5	79.3
	192	1	.5	.5	79.8
	193	1	.5	.5	80.3
	194	1	.5	.5	80.8
	195	1	.5	.5	81.3
	196	1	.5	.5	81.8
	197	1	.5	.5	82.3
	198	1	.5	.5	82.8
	199	1	.5	.5	83.3
	200	1	.5	.5	83.7
	202	1	.5	.5	84.2
	203	1	.5	.5	84.7
	204	1	.5	.5	85.2
	205	1	.5	.5	85.7
	206	1	.5	.5	86.2
	208	1	.5	.5	86.7
	209	1	.5	.5	87.2
	210	1	.5	.5	87.7
	211	1	.5	.5	88.2
	212	1	.5	.5	88.7
	213	1	.5	.5	89.2
	214	1	.5	.5	89.7
	216	1	.5	.5	90.1
	217	1	.5	.5	90.6
	218	1	.5	.5	91.1
	219	1	.5	.5	91.6
	220	1	.5	.5	92.1
	223	1	.5	.5	92.6
	224	1	.5	.5	93.1
	225	1	.5	.5	93.6
	226	1	.5	.5	94.1
	227	1	.5	.5	94.6
	228	1	.5	.5	95.1
	229	1	.5	.5	95.6
	230	1	.5	.5	96.1
	231	1	.5	.5	96.6
	232	1	.5	.5	97.0
	233	1	.5	.5	97.5
	234	1	.5	.5	98.0
	236	1	.5	.5	98.5
	237	1	.5	.5	99.0
	238	1	.5	.5	99.5
	239	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	203	100.0	100.0	

```
path = m:\copnews\product\media
title = Public Information Officer Survey - Media Codebook
ncases = 442
records/case = 2
lrecl = 80
blank = -1
*
name =    CASEID
label = Case identification number
record = 1
column = 1
width = 4
*
name =    Q1
label =
record = 1
column = 7
width = 1
labels =
            1 Newspaper Managers
            2 Newspaper Reporters
            3 Television Managers
            4 Television Reporters
text =
        What type of questionnaire is this?


*
name =    q1a
label =
record = 1
column = 8
width =  3
md1 =     999
md2 =     998
labels =
            0 zero percent
            1 percent
           99 percent
          100 percent
          997 can't estimate
          998 don't know
          999 not answered
text =
        Of all the news stories devoted to local crime news, in
        the past 12 months, about what percent was devoted to the
        following:

        crime incidents and investigations


*
name =    q1b
label =
record = 1
column = 11
width =  3
md1 =     999
md2 =     998
```

```
labels =
                0 zero percent
                1 percent
               99 percent
              100 percent
              997 can't estimate
              998 don't know
              999 not answered
text =
         Of all the news stories devoted to local crime news, in
         the past 12 months, about what percent was devoted to the
         following:

         law enforcement programs and initiatives like
         community policing

*
name =    q1c
label =
record = 1
column = 14
width =   3
md1 =     999
md2 =     998
labels =
                0 zero percent
                1 percent
               99 percent
              100 percent
              997 can't estimate
              998 don't know
              999 not answered
text =
         Of all the news stories devoted to local crime news, in
         the past 12 months, about what percent was devoted to the
         following:

         law enforcement misconduct

*
name =    q1d
label =
record = 1
column = 17
width =   3
md1 =     999
md2 =     998
labels =
                0 zero percent
                1 percent
               99 percent
              100 percent
              997 can't estimate
              998 don't know
              999 not answered
text =
         Of all the news stories devoted to local crime news, in
```

the past 12 months, about what percent was devoted to the
following:

other criminal justice issues

*

name =   q2a
label =
record = 1
column = 20
width =   1
labels =
          1 answered
          9 not answered
text =
          Considering all sources that have provided information to
          your newspaper/station about local law enforcement agencies
          in the past 12 months, which of the following was the most
          important:

          Chief of Police or Sheriff

*

name =   q2b
label =
record = 1
column = 21
width =   1
labels =
          1 answered
          9 not answered
text =
          Considering all sources that have provided information to
          your newspaper/station about local law enforcement agencies
          in the past 12 months, which of the following was the most
          important:

          Public information officer

*

name =   q2c
label =
record = 1
column = 22
width =   1
labels =
          1 answered
          9 not answered
text =
          Considering all sources that have provided information to
          your newspaper/station about local law enforcement agencies
          in the past 12 months, which of the following was the most
          important:

          Other law enforcement agency executive

*

```
name =    q2d
label =
record = 1
column = 23
width =   1
labels =
            1 answered
            9 not answered
text =
         Considering all sources that have provided information to
         your newspaper/station about local law enforcement agencies
         in the past 12 months, which of the following was the most
         important:

         Individual law enforcement officers

*

name =    q2e
label =
record = 1
column = 24
width =   1
labels =
            1 answered (specify)
            9 not answered
text =
         Considering all sources that have provided information to
         your newspaper/station about local law enforcement agencies
         in the past 12 months, which of the following was the most
         important:

         Other

*

name =    q2a2
label =
record = 1
column = 25
width =   1
labels =
            1 answered (specify)
            9 not answered
text =
         Briefly describe why this was the most important source
         for your newspaper/station.

*

name =    q3
label =
record = 1
column = 26
width =   3
md1 =     999
md2 =     998
labels =
            0 zero percent
            1 percent
```

```
              99 percent
             100 percent
             997 can't estimate
             998 don't know
             999 not answered
text =
        In the past 12 months, about what percent of information
        regarding crime incidents was provided by law enforcement
        sources?


*
name =    r4
label =
record = 1
column = 29
width =   2
md1 =     99
md2 =     98
labels =
               1 daily
               2 weekly
               3 semimonthly
               4 monthly
               5 about twice a year
               6 about once a year
               7 never
               8 two responses circled (specify)
              98 don't know
              99 not answered
text =
        In the past 12 months, about how often did you meet with
        the police chief(s) or sheriff(s) of local law enforcement
        agencies?


*
name =    m4
label =
record = 1
column = 31
width =   2
md1 =     99
md2 =     98
labels =
               1 weekly
               2 semimonthly
               3 monthly
               4 about twice a year
               5 about once a year
               6 never
               8 two responses circled (specify)
              98 don't know
              99 not answered
text =
        In the past 12 months, about how often did you meet with
        the police chief(s) or sheriff(s) of local law enforcement
        agencies?
```

```
*
name  =    q5
label =
record = 1
column = 33
width =   3
md1 =     999
md2 =     998
labels =
              1 law enforcement agencies
            996 law enforcement agencies
            997 can't estimate
            998 don't know
            999 not answered
text =
          About how many local law enforcement agencies are there in
          your newspaper/station's local coverage area?


*
name  =    q6
label =
record = 1
column = 36
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
              1 very accessible
              2 somewhat accessible
              3 not very accessible
              4 not at all accessible
              8 don't know
              9 not answered
text =
          In general, how accessible to your newspaper/station are
          the chief executives (e.g., police chief) of local
          law enforcement agencies?


*
name  =    q7
label =
record = 1
column = 37
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
              1 very accessible
              2 somewhat accessible
              3 not very accessible
              4 not at all accessible
              8 don't know
              9 not answered
text =
          In general, how accessible to your newspaper/station are
          the public information staffs of local law
          enforcement agencies?
```

```
*
name =   q8
label =
record = 1
column = 38
width =  1
md1 =    9
md2 =    8
labels =
           1 yes (Please answer question 8a.)
           2 no (Please go to question 9.)
           8 don't know
           9 not answered
text =
         Currently, are there law enforcement agencies with whom
         your newspaper/station has a better relationship
         than others?

*
name =   q8a
label =
record = 1
column = 39
width =  1
labels =
           1 answered (specify)
           9 not answered (goto q9)
text =
         Please list some factors that make these relationships better.

*
name =   q8b
label =
record = 1
column = 40
width =  1
labels =
           1 answered (specify)
           9 not answered (goto q9)
text =
         Please list some factors that make these relationships better.

*
name =   q8c
label =
record = 1
column = 41
width =  1
labels =
           1 answered (specify)
           9 not answered
text =
         Please list some factors that make these relationships better.

*
name =   q9
```

```
label =
record = 1
column = 42
width =  1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
           1 yes   (Please answer question 9a.)
           2 no    (Please go to question 10.)
           8 don't know
           9 not answered
text =
        Currently, are there law enforcement agencies with whom
        your newspaper/station has a more adversarial
        relationship than others?

*

name =    q9a
label =
record = 1
column = 43
width =  1
labels =
           1 answered (specify)
           9 not answered
text =
        Please list some factors that make these relationships more
        adversarial.

*

name =    q9b
label =
record = 1
column = 44
width =  1
labels =
           1 answered (specify)
           9 not answered
text =
        Please list some factors that make these relationships more
        adversarial.

*

name =    q9c
label =
record = 1
column = 45
width =  1
labels =
           1 answered (specify)
           9 not answered
text =
        Please list some factors that make these relationships more
        adversarial.

*

name =    q10a
```

```
label =
record = 1
column = 46
width =    1
md1 =      9
md2 =      8
labels =
            1 strongly disagree
            2
            3
            4
            5 strongly agree
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
text =
        Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
        of the following statements.

        Most citizens in our local coverage area have
        a favorable opinion of local law enforcement
        agencies.

*
name =    q10b
label =
record = 1
column = 47
width =    1
md1 =      9
md2 =      8
labels =
            1 strongly disagree
            2
            3
            4
            5 strongly agree
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
text =
        Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
        of the following statements.

        The local news media play an important role in
        shaping community perceptions of local law
        enforcement agencies.

*
name =    q10c
label =
record = 1
column = 48
width =    1
md1 =      9
md2 =      8
labels =
            1 strongly disagree
            2
```

```
                    3
                    4
                    5 strongly agree
                    8 don't know
                    9 not answered
text =
          Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
          of the following statements.

          My newspaper/station's relationship with local law
          enforcement agencies is generally good.

*

name =    q10d
label =
record = 1
column = 49
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
                    1 strongly disagree
                    2
                    3
                    4
                    5 strongly agree
                    8 don't know
                    9 not answered
text =
          Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
          of the following statements.

          Citizens in our local coverage area are interested
          in news about local law enforcement agencies.

•

name =    q10e
label =
record = 1
column = 50
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
                    1 strongly disagree
                    2
                    3
                    4
                    5 strongly agree
                    8 don't know
                    9 not answered
text =
          Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
          of the following statements.

          The image of law enforcement that is portrayed
          in the local media is generally positive.
```

```
*
name =    q10f
label =
record = 1
column = 51
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
              1 strongly disagree
              2
              3
              4
              5 strongly agree
              8 don't know
              9 not answered
text =
        Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
        of the following statements.

        Local law enforcement public information officers
        do a good job of keeping my newspaper/station
        informed about crime incidents.

*
name =    q10g
label =
record = 1
column = 52
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
              1 strongly disagree
              2
              3
              4
              5 strongly agree
              8 don't know
              9 not answered
text =
        Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
        of the following statements.

        Local law enforcement public information officers
        do a good job of keeping my newspaper/station informed
        about innovative law enforcement programs.

*
name =    q10h
label =
record = 1
column = 53
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
```

```
labels =
            1 strongly disagree
            2
            3
            4
            5 strongly agree
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
text =
        Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
        of the following statements.

        The information provided in local law enforcement
        press releases is helpful.

*
name =   q11
label =
record = 1
column = 54
width =  1
md1 =       9
md2 =       8
labels =
            1 yes   (Please answer question 12.)
            2 no   (Please go to question 17.)
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
text =
        Are there community policing programs in your newspaper/station's
        local coverage area?

•
name =   q12
label =
record = 1
column = 55
width =  1
md1 =       9
md2 =       8
labels =
            1 very familiar
            2 somewhat familiar
            3 not very familiar
            4 not at all familiar
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
text =
        How familiar are you with the various types of community
        policing activities occurring in your local coverage area?

*
name =   q13a
label =
record = 1
column = 56
width =  1
```

```
labels =
          1 answered
          9 not answered
text =
          Considering all sources, in general, who is most likely
          to keep your newspaper/station informed about local law
          enforcement agencies' community policing activities?

          Chief of Police or Sheriff

*

name =    q13b
label =
record = 1
column = 57
width =   1
labels =
          1 answered
          9 not answered
text =
          Considering all sources, in general, who is most likely
          to keep your newspaper/station informed about local law
          enforcement agencies' community policing activities?

          Public information officer

*

name =    q13c
label =
record = 1
column = 58
width =   1
labels =
          1 answered
          9 not answered
text =
          Considering all sources, in general, who is most likely
          to keep your newspaper/station informed about local law
          enforcement agencies' community policing activities?

          Other law enforcement executive

*

name =    q13d
label =
record = 1
column = 59
width =   1
labels =
          1 answered
          9 not answered
text =
          Considering all sources, in general, who is most likely
          to keep your newspaper/station informed about local law
          enforcement agencies' community policing activities?

          Individual law enforcement officers
```

```
*
name  =    q13e
label =
record = 1
column = 60
width =    1
labels =
                1 answered (specify)
                9 not answered
text =
        Considering all sources, in general, who is most likely
        to keep your newspaper/station informed about local law
        enforcement agencies' community policing activities?

        Other


*
name  =    r14
label =
record = 1
column = 61
width =    1
md1 =      9
md2 =      8
labels =
                1 yes   (Please answer question 14a.)
                2 no    (Please go to question 15.)
                8 don't know
                9 not answered
text =
        In the past 12 months, have you done a story that discussed
        local community policing activities?


*
name  =    r14a
label =
record = 1
column = 62
width =    1
md1 =      9
md2 =      8
labels =
                1 1 to 2 stories
                2 3 to 4 stories
                3 5 to 7 stories
                4 8 to 10 stories
                5 11 stories or more
                6 two responses circled (specify)
                8 don't know
                9 not answered
text =
        Please indicate the number of community policing stories
        you have done in the past 12 months.


*

name  =    m14
```

```
label =
record = 1
column = 63
width = 1
md1 =      9
md2 =      8
labels =
            1 daily
            2 weekly
            3 monthly
            4 about twice a year
            5 other (please specify)
            6 two responses circled (specify)
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
text =
        In the past 12 months, about how often have stories about
        local community policing appeared in your newspaper/station?

*
name =    q15a
label =
record = 1
column = 64
width = 1
md1 =      9
md2 =      8
labels =
            1 strongly disagree
            2
            3
            4
            5 strongly agree
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
text =
        Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the
        following statements.

        My newspaper/station's relationship with local law
        enforcement agencies has improved since the
        introduction of community policing.

*
name =    q15b
label =
record = 1
column = 65
width = 1
md1 =      9
md2 =      8
labels =
            1 strongly disagree
            2
            3
            4
            5 strongly agree
```

```
                    8 don't know
                    9 not answered
     text =
                Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the
                following statements.

                The public is interested in local community
                policing activities.

     *
     name =    q16a
     label =
     record = 2
     column = 1
     width =  1
     labels =
                    1 answered
                    9 not answered
     text =
                What would be the best way for a law enforcement agency to
                inform your newspaper/station about a community policing
                program to increase the likelihood of publication?

                News conference

     *
     name =    q16b
     label =
     record = 2
     column = 2
     width =  1
     labels =
                    1 answered
                    9 not answered
     text =
                What would be the best way for a law enforcement agency to
                inform your newspaper/station about a community policing
                program to increase the likelihood of publication?

                Press release

     *
     name =    q16c
     label =
     record = 2
     column = 3
     width =  1
     labels =
                    1 answered
                    9 not answered
     text =
                What would be the best way for a law enforcement agency to
                inform your newspaper/station about a community policing
                program to increase the likelihood of publication?

                Public information officer contacting your
                newspaper/station directly
```

```
*
name =    q16d
label =
record =  2
column =  4
width =   1
labels =
            1 answered(specify)
            9 not answered
text =
        What would be the best way for a law enforcement agency to
        inform your newspaper/station about a community policing
        program to increase the likelihood of publication?

        Other


*
name =    q17
label =
record =  2
column =  5
width =   3
md1 =       999
md2 =       998
labels =
            0 zero percent
            1 percent
           99 percent
          100 percent
          997 can't estimate
          998 don't know
          999 not answered
text =
        In the past 12 months, about what percent of the time were
        local law enforcement agencies able to get coverage of
        innovative police programs when they sought such coverage
        from your newspaper/station?


*
name =    q18
label =
record =  2
column =  8
width =   1
labels =
            1 answered (specify)
            9 not answered
text =
        What is your title or position?


*
name =    q19a
label =
record =  2
column =  9
width =   2
```

```
md1 =      99
md2 =      98
labels =
              0 zero years
              1 years
             50 years
             51 51 or more years
             97 can't estimate
             98 don't know
             99 not answered
text =
         How long have you served in your current position?

         Years

*
name =    q19b
label =
record = 2
column = 11
width =   2
md1 =      99
md2 =      98
labels =
              0 zero months
              1 months
             12 months
             97 can't estimate
             98 don't know
             99 not answered
text =
         How long have you served in your current position?

         Months

*
name =    q19c
label =
record = 2
column = 13
width =   2
md1 =      99
md2 =      98
labels =
              0 zero
              1 years
             50 years
             51 51 or more years
             97 can't estimate
             98 don't know
             99 not answered
text =
         INTERVIEWER: HOW MANY YEARS?
         (COMBINATION OF YEARS & MONTHS; ROUNDED)

         Years
```

```
*
name =   STCD
label =
record = 2
column = 15
width =  2
min =    1
labels =
            1 Alabama
            2 Alaska
            4 Arizona
            5 Arkansas
            6 California
            8 Colorado
            9 Connecticut
           10 Delaware
           11 District of Columbia
           12 Florida
           13 Georgia
           15 Hawaii
           16 Idaho
           17 Illinois
           18 Indiana
           19 Iowa
           20 Kansas
           21 Kentucky
           22 Louisiana
           23 Maine
           24 Maryland
           25 Massachusetts
           26 Michigan
           27 Minnesota
           28 Mississippi
           29 Missouri
           30 Montana
           31 Nebraska
           32 Nevada
           33 New Hampshire
           34 New Jersey
           35 New Mexico
           36 New York
           37 North Carolina
           38 North Dakota
           39 Ohio
           40 Oklahoma
           41 Oregon
           42 Pennsylvania
           44 Rhode Island
           45 South Carolina
           46 South Dakota
           47 Tennessee
           48 Texas
           49 Utah
           50 Vermont
           51 Virginia
           53 Washington
           54 West Virginia
```

```
                    55  Wisconsin
                    56  Wyoming

        text =
                State Identification Code

        text =
                State Identification Code

        *
        name  =    RTCD
        label =
        record = 2
        column = 17
        width  = 1
        min   =    1
        labels =
                    1 Returned after 1st mailing but before postcard
                    2 Returned after postcard but before 2nd mailing
                    3 Returned after 2nd mailing

        text =
                Questionnaire Return Identification Code

        *
        name  =    SMPL
        label =
        record = 2
        column = 18
        width  = 1
        min   =    1
        labels =
                    1 Police Information Officer
                    2 Newspaper Manager
                    3 TV Manager
                    4 Newspaper Reporter
                    5 TV Reporter

        text =
                Sub-sample Identification Code

        *
        name  =    MSA
        label =
        record = 2
        column = 19
        width  = 4
        min   =    0
        labels =
                    0000 Code
                    9999 Code

        text =
                MSA CODE

        *
        name  =    PTCD
```

```
label =
record = 2
column = 23
width =    4
min =      0
labels =
          0001 Code
          9999 Code

text =
          Newspaper or TV Station Code
```

```
path = m:\copnews\product\cops
title = Police Information Officer Codebook
ncases = 203
records/case = 2
lrecl = 80
blank = -1
*
name =    CASEID
label =   Case identification number
record = 1
column = 1
width = 4
*
name =    Q1
label =
record = 1
column = 7
width = 1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
          1 yes (Please answer question 1a.)(goto q1aa)
          2 no (Please answer question 1b.)(goto q1b)
          8 don't know (goto q2a)
          9 not answered (goto q2a)
text =
          Does your law enforcement agency have at least one member
          whose main job is to serve as public information officer?

*
name =    q1aa
label =
record = 1
column = 8
width =   2
md1 =      99
md2 =      98
labels =
               0 zero
               1 members
              96 members
              97 can't estimate
              98 don't know
              99 not answered
text =
          How many members of your agency are assigned to the public
          information office?

          number of sworn members

*
name =    q1ab
label =
record = 1
column = 10
width =   2
md1 =      99
```

```
md2 =       98
labels =
                0  zero
                1  members
               96  members
               97  can't estimate
               98  don't know
               99  not answered
text =
           How many members of your agency are assigned to the public
           information office?

           number of unsworn members


*
name =     q1b
label =
record = 1
column = 12
width =    1
labels =
                1  answered (specify)
                9  not answered
text =
           Since your agency does not have a member specifically
           designated to serve as public information officer, who
           performs these duties?


*
name =     q2a
label =
record = 1
column = 13
width =    3
md1 =       999
md2 =       998
labels =
                0  zero percent
                1  percent
               99  percent
              100  percent
              997  can't estimate
              998  don't know
              999  not answered
text =
           Please estimate the percent of time you and your staff
           have spent on each of the following public information
           activities in the past 12 months:

           providing information about recent crimes


*
name =     q2b
label =
record = 1
column = 16
width =    3
```

```
md1  =      999
md2  =      998
labels =
                0  zero percent
                1  percent
               99  percent
              100  percent
              997  can't estimate
              998  don't know
              999  not answered
text =
            Please estimate the percent of time you and your staff
            have spent on each of the following public information
            activities in the past 12 months:

            providing information about police initiatives
            like community policing


*

name  =     q2c
label =
record =  1
column =  19
width  =  3
md1  =      999
md2  =      998
labels =
                0  zero percent
                1  percent
               99  percent
              100  percent
              997  can't estimate
              998  don't know
              999  not answered
text =
            Please estimate the percent of time you and your staff
            have spent on each of the following public information
            activities in the past 12 months:

            providing information about issues of
            police misconduct


*

name  =     q2d
label =
record =  1
column =  22
width  =  3
md1  =      999
md2  =      998
labels =
                0  zero percent
                1  percent
               99  percent
              100  percent
              997  can't estimate
              998  don't know
```

999 not answered

text =

Please estimate the percent of time you and your staff
have spent on each of the following public information
activities in the past 12 months:

providing information about organizational policy

*

name =   q2e
label =
record = 1
column = 25
width = 3
md1 =   999
md2 =   998
labels =

          0 zero percent
          1 percent
         99 percent
        100 percent
        997 can't estimate
        998 don't know
        999 not answered

text =

Please estimate the percent of time you and your staff
have spent on each of the following public information
activities in the past 12 months:

providing other types of information
(please specify below)

percentage

*

name =   q2e1
label =
record = 1
column = 28
width = 1
labels =

          1 answered (specify)
          9 not answered

text =

Please estimate the percent of time you and your staff
have spent on each of the following public information
activities in the past 12 months:

providing other types of information
(please specify below)

Text

*

name =   q3a
label =
record = 1

```
column = 29
width =   2
md1 =       99
md2 =       98
labels =
                0 zero
                1 newspapers
               96 newspapers
               97 can't estimate
               98 don't know
               99 not answered
text =
          For each of the following, please list the number of media
          outlets you and your staff communicate with at least once
          a week:

          newspapers

*

name =    q3b
label =
record = 1
column = 31
width =   2
md1 =       99
md2 =       98
labels =
                0 zero
                1 Television stations
               96 Television stations
               97 can't estimate
               98 don't know
               99 not answered
text =
          For each of the following, please list the number of media
          outlets you and your staff communicate with at least once
          a week:

          television stations

*

name =    q3c
label =
record = 1
column = 33
width =   2
md1 =       99
md2 =       98
labels =
                0 zero
                1 radio stations
               96 radio stations
               97 can't estimate
               98 don't know
               99 not answered
text =
          For each of the following, please list the number of media
```

outlets you and your staff communicate with at least once
a week:

radio stations

```
*

name =    q4
label =
record = 1
column = 35
width =   2
md1 =     99
md2 =     98
labels =
                0 zero
                1 reporters
               96 reporters
               97 can't estimate
               98 don't know
               99 not answered
text =
        In an average week, how many different reporters contact
        you or your staff for information?


*

name =    q5
label =
record = 1
column = 37
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
                1 less than once a month
                2 monthly
                3 weekly
                4 daily
                5 several times a day
                6 two responses circled (specify)
                8 don't know
                9 not answered
text =
        How often do you or your staff meet with your chief executive?


*

name =    6a
label =
record = 1
column = 38
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
                1 never
                2 less than once a month
                3 monthly
                4 weekly
```

```
                        5 daily
                        8 don't know
                        9 not answered
        text =
                In the past 12 months, how often have you or your staff
                done each of the following?

                Contacted public information officers in
                other law enforcement agencies

*
name =      6b
label =
record = 1
column = 39
width = 1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
                        1 never
                        2 less than once a month
                        3 monthly
                        4 weekly
                        5 daily
                        8 don't know
                        9 not answered
        text =
                In the past 12 months, how often have you or your staff
                done each of the following?

                Communicated with other public information
                officers in your jurisdiction (e.g., mayor's
                office, fire department)

*
name =      6c
label =
record = 1
column = 40
width = 1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
                        1 never
                        2 less than once a month
                        3 monthly
                        4 weekly
                        5 daily
                        8 don't know
                        9 not answered
        text =
                In the past 12 months, how often have you or your staff
                done each of the following?

                Communicated with community or business
                groups
```

```
*
name =    6d
label =
record = 1
column = 41
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
              1 never
              2 less than once a month
              3 monthly
              4 weekly
              5 daily
              8 don't know
              9 not answered
text =
         In the past 12 months, how often have you or your staff
         done each of the following?

         Issued press releases


*
name =    6e
label =
record = 1
column = 42
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
              1 never
              2 less than once a month
              3 monthly
              4 weekly
              5 daily
              8 don't know
              9 not answered
text =
         In the past 12 months, how often have you or your staff
         done each of the following?

         Held meetings with management of local
         news media outlets


*
name =    q7a
label =
record = 1
column = 43
width =   1
labels =
              1 answered
              9 not answered
text =
         If you or your staff were seeking to publicize a project
         like bicycle patrols or a new investigative technique,
```

what strategy would you most likely use?

a press release

```
*
name  =    q7b
label =
record = 1
column = 44
width =  1
labels =
            1 answered
            9 not answered
text =
```
If you or your staff were seeking to publicize a project
like bicycle patrols or a new investigative technique,
what strategy would you most likely use?

communicate directly with media outlets

```
*
name  =    q7c
label =
record = 1
column = 45
width =  1
labels =
            1 answered
            9 not answered
text =
```
If you or your staff were seeking to publicize a project
like bicycle patrols or a new investigative technique,
what strategy would you most likely use?

news conference

```
*
name  =    q7d
label =
record = 1
column = 46
width =  1
labels =
            1 answered
            9 not answered
text =
```
If you or your staff were seeking to publicize a project
like bicycle patrols or a new investigative technique,
what strategy would you most likely use?

describe during a regularly scheduled meeting

```
*
name  =    q7e
label =
record = 1
column = 47
```

```
width = 1
labels =
            1 answered (specify)
            9 not answered
text =
        If you or your staff were seeking to publicize a project
        like bicycle patrols or a new investigative technique,
        what strategy would you most likely use?

        Other


*

name =   q7aa
label =
record = 1
column = 48
width = 1
labels =
            1 answered (specify)
            9 not answered
text =
        Why would you use the method indicated in question 7 above?


*

name =   q8
label =
record = 1
column = 49
width = 1
md1 =    9
md2 =    8
labels =
            1 yes   (Please answer question 8a.)(goto q8a)
            2 no    (Please go to question 9.)
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
text =
        In 1996, did your public information budget include specified
        moneys for publicizing agency activities and programs?


*

name =   q8a
label =
record = 1
column = 50
width = 1
labels =
            1 answered (specify)
            9 not answered
text =
        What was the specified dollar amount?


*

name =   q9a
label =
record = 1
column = 51
```

```
width = 1
md1 =    9
md2 =    8
labels =
            1 strongly disagree
            2
            3
            4
            5 strongly agree
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
text =
        Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
        of the following statements.

        Our agency does a good job of publicizing
        the positive aspects of the agency

*
name =    q9b
label =
record = 1
column = 52
width =  1
md1 =    9
md2 =    8
labels =
            1 strongly disagree
            2
            3
            4
            5 strongly agree
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
text =
        Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
        of the following statements.

        Most citizens in the community we serve
        have a favorable opinion of our agency

*
name =    q9c
label =
record = 1
column = 53
width =  1
md1 =    9
md2 =    8
labels =
            1 strongly disagree
            2
            3
            4
            5 strongly agree
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
```

text =

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
of the following statements.

Most public information activities in our
agency revolve around disseminating
information about crimes and criminal
investigations

*

name =   q9d
label =
record = 1
column = 54
width = 1
md1 =   9
md2 =   8
labels =

        1 strongly disagree
        2
        3
        4
        5 strongly agree
        8 don't know
        9 not answered

text =

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
of the following statements.

In general, local news media are more
interested in reporting about problems in
our agency than about our accomplishments

*

name =   q9e
label =
record = 1
column = 55
width = 1
md1 =   9
md2 =   8
labels =

        1 strongly disagree
        2
        3
        4
        5 strongly agree
        8 don't know
        9 not answered

text =

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
of the following statements.

Public information activities are a very
important component in maintaining our
agency's image

```
*
name =    q9f
label =
record = 1
column = 56
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
              1 strongly disagree
              2
              3
              4
              5 strongly agree
              8 don't know
              9 not answered
text =
          Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
          of the following statements.

          Media images of our agency influence
          community perceptions about us

*
name =    q9g
label =
record = 1
column = 57
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
              1 strongly disagree
              2
              3
              4
              5 strongly agree
              8 don't know
              9 not answered
text =
          Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
          of the following statements.

          Our agency's relationship with local news
          media is good

*
name =    q9h
label =
record = 1
column = 58
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
              1 strongly disagree
              2
```

```
                           3
                           4
                           5 strongly agree
                           8 don't know
                           9 not answered

          text =
                    Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
                    of the following statements.

                    Media coverage of law enforcement
                    misconduct in other communities adversely
                    affects police-community relations in the
                    community our agency serves

          *
          name =    q9i
          label =
          record = 1
          column = 59
          width =  1
          md1 =     9
          md2 =     8
          labels =
                           1 strongly disagree
                           2
                           3
                           4
                           5 strongly agree
                           8 don't know
                           9 not answered

          text =
                    Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
                    of the following statements.

                    The local news media devote too much
                    attention to crime

          *
          name =    q10
          label =
          record = 1
          column = 60
          width =  1
          labels =
                           1 answered (specify)
                           9 not answered

          text =
                    What, if anything, could be done to improve the quality
                    of the relationships between your agency and the local
                    news media?

          *
          name =    q11
          label =
          record = 1
          column = 61
          width =  1
```

```
md1 =      9
md2 =      8
labels =
            1 yes   (Please answer question 12.)(goto q12a)
            2 no   (Please go to question 16 on page 6.)
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
text =
        Does your law enforcement agency have a community policing
        program?

*
name =   q12a
label =
record = 1
column = 62
width =  1
md1 =      9
md2 =      8
labels =
            1 strongly disagree
            2
            3
            4
            5 strongly agree
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
text =
        Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
        of the following statements about your community policing program

        Good relationships between the news
        media and our agency are an important
        component of our community policing
        program

*
name =   q12b
label =
record = 1
column = 63
width =  1
md1 =      9
md2 =      8
labels =
            1 strongly disagree
            2
            3
            4
            5 strongly agree
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
text =
        Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
        of the following statements about your community policing program

        In general, when our agency wants to publicize
```

```
                    a new community policing activity, the
                    local media are accommodating

         *
         name =     q12c
         label =
         record = 1
         column = 64
         width =    1
         md1 =      9
         md2 =      8
         labels =
                    1 strongly disagree
                    2
                    3
                    4
                    5 strongly agree
                    8 don't know
                    9 not answered
         text =
                    Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
                    of the following statements about your community policing program

                    Public information duties have been decentralized as
                    part of our community policing program

         *
         name =     q12d
         label =
         record = 1
         column = 65
         width =    1
         md1 =      9
         md2 =      8
         labels =
                    1 strongly disagree
                    2
                    3
                    4
                    5 strongly agree
                    8 don't know
                    9 not answered
         text =
                    Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
                    of the following statements about your community policing program

                    Community policing has increased the amount of contact
                    between officers in our agency and the news media

         *
         name =     q12e
         label =
         record = 1
         column = 66
         width =    1
         md1 =      9
         md2 =      8
```

```
labels =
            1 strongly disagree
            2
            3
            4
            5 strongly agree
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
text =
        Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each
        of the following statements about your community policing program

        Community policing has been an asset for our agency

*
name =    q13
label =
record = 1
column = 67
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
            1 yes    (Please answer question 13a.)(goto q13a)
            2 no     (Please go to question 14.)
            8 don't know
            9 not answered
text =
        Not including local news media, does your law enforcement
        agency use other strategies to publicize its community
        policing program?  Examples include newsletters, face-to-face
        contact, and community meetings.

*
name =    q13a
label =
record = 1
column = 68
width =   1
labels =
            1 answered (specify)
            9 not answered
text =
        Briefly describe these strategies.

*
name =    q14a
label =
record = 1
column = 69
width =   1
labels =
            1 answered
            9 not answered
text =
        Which of the following do you feel is the best way to
        publicize your community policing efforts?
```

```
          television

*

name =    q14b
label =
record = 1
column = 70
width =   1
labels =
            1 answered
            9 not answered
text =
        Which of the following do you feel is the best way to
        publicize your community policing efforts?

        newspapers


*

name =    q14c
label =
record = 1
column = 71
width =   1
labels =
            1 answered
            9 not answered
text =
        Which of the following do you feel is the best way to
        publicize your community policing efforts?

        radio


*

name =    q14d
label =
record = 1
column = 72
width =   1
labels =
            1 answered (please specify)
            9 not answered
text =
        Which of the following do you feel is the best way to
        publicize your community policing efforts?

        Other


*

name =    q15a
label =
record = 1
column = 73
width =   1
labels =
            1 answered (specify)
            5 none (goto q16)
```

```
                    9 not answered(goto q16)
text =
          Not including you and your staff, what other units in your
          law enforcement agency have responsibility for publicizing
          the agency's community policing efforts?

          Unit 1

     *
name =    q15b
label =
record = 1
column = 74
width =   1
labels =
                    1 answered (specify)
                    5 none
                    9 not answered
text =
          Not including you and your staff, what other units in your
          law enforcement agency have responsibility for publicizing
          the agency's community policing efforts?

          Unit 2

     *
name =    q15c
label =
record = 1
column = 75
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
                    1 never
                    2 less than once a month
                    3 monthly
                    4 weekly
                    5 daily
                    6 two responses circled (specify)
                    8 don't know
                    9 not answered
text =
          In the past 12 months, how often have you had contact with
          the units listed in question 15 above regarding community
          policing activities?

          Unit 1

     *
name =    q15d
label =
record = 1
column = 76
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
```

```
labels =
                1 never
                2 less than once a month
                3 monthly
                4 weekly
                5 daily
                6 two responses circled (specify)
                8 don't know
                9 not answered
text =
        In the past 12 months, how often have you had contact with
        the units listed in question 15 above regarding community
        policing activities?

        Unit 2

*

name =    q16
label =
record = 2
column = 1
width =   3
md1 =      999
md2 =      998
labels =
                  0 zero percent
                  1 percent
                 99 percent
                100 percent
                997 can't estimate
                998 don't know
                999 not answered
text =
        In the past 12 months, about what percent of the time
        were you or your staff successful in convincing local
        news media to carry stories about the positive aspects
        of your agency?

*

name =    q17a
label =
record = 2
column = 4
width =   1
labels =
                1 answered (specify)
                9 not answered(goto q18)
text =
        Please list three law enforcement agencies, not including
        your own, that you think are particularly successful in
        getting publicity for their community policing efforts.

        Agency 1

*

name =    q17b
label =
```

```
record = 2
column = 5
width =   1
labels =
                1 answered (specify)
                9 not answered(goto q18)
text =
        Please list three law enforcement agencies, not including
        your own, that you think are particularly successful in
        getting publicity for their community policing efforts.

        Agency 2


*

name =    q17c
label =
record = 2
column = 6
width =   1
labels =
                1 answered (specify)
                9 not answered
text =
        Please list three law enforcement agencies, not including
        your own, that you think are particularly successful in
        getting publicity for their community policing efforts.

        Agency 3

*

name =    q18
label =
record = 2
column = 7
width =   1
labels =
                1 answered (specify)
                9 not answered
text =
        What is your position at your agency?

*

name =    q19a
label =
record = 2
column = 8
width =   2
md1 =     99
md2 =     98
labels =
                0 zero
                1 years
               50 years
               51 51 or more years
               97 can't estimate
               98 don't know
               99 not answered
```

```
text =
          How long have you served in your current position?

          Years

*
name =    q19b
label =
record =  2
column =  10
width =   2
md1 =     99
md2 =     98
labels =
               0 zero
               1 months
              12 months
              97 can't estimate
              98 don't know
              99 not answered
text =
          How long have you served in your current position?

          Months

*
name =    q19c
label =
record =  2
column =  12
width =   2
md1 =     99
md2 =     98
labels =
               0 zero
               1 years
              50 years
              51 51 ore more years
              97 can't estimate
              98 don't know
              99 not answered
text =
          INTERVIEWER: HOW MANY YEARS?
          (COMBINATION OF YEARS & MONTHS; ROUNDED)

          Years

*
name =    q20
label =
record =  2
column =  14
width =   2
md1 =     99
labels =
               1 police chief/commissioner
               2 assistant to chief/deputy chief/deputy commissione
```

```
                     3 captain
                     4 lieutenant
                     5 sergeant
                     6 patrol officer
                     7 sheriff
                     8 public information officer
                     9 other (specify)
                    10 civilian
                    11 detective
                    99 not answered
text =
          What is your rank?


*

name =    q21
label =
record = 2
column = 16
width =   3
md1 =     99
md2 =     98
labels =
                     0 zero
                     1 hours
                    96 hours
                    97 can't estimate
                    98 don't know
                    99 not answered
text =
          About how many hours of formal training have you received
          in police-news media relations?


*

name =    q22
label =
record = 2
column = 19
width =   1
md1 =     9
md2 =     8
labels =
                     1 more than adequate
                     2 about right
                     3 not enough
                     8 don't know
                     9 not answered
text =
          Would you say that the amount of formal training you have
          received in police-news media relations is:


*

name =    STCD
label =
record = 2
column = 20
width =   2
min =     1
```

```
labels =
                1 Alabama
                2 Alaska
                4 Arizona
                5 Arkansas
                6 California
                8 Colorado
                9 Connecticut
               10 Delaware
               11 District of Columbia
               12 Florida
               13 Georgia
               15 Hawaii
               16 Idaho
               17 Illinois
               18 Indiana
               19 Iowa
               20 Kansas
               21 Kentucky
               22 Louisiana
               23 Maine
               24 Maryland
               25 Massachusetts
               26 Michigan
               27 Minnesota
               28 Mississippi
               29 Missouri
               30 Montana
               31 Nebraska
               32 Nevada
               33 New Hampshire
               34 New Jersey
               35 New Mexico
               36 New York
               37 North Carolina
               38 North Dakota
               39 Ohio
               40 Oklahoma
               41 Oregon
               42 Pennsylvania
               44 Rhode Island
               45 South Carolina
               46 South Dakota
               47 Tennessee
               48 Texas
               49 Utah
               50 Vermont
               51 Virginia
               53 Washington
               54 West Virginia
               55 Wisconsin
               56 Wyoming

text =
          State Identification Code

text =
```

```
               State Identification Code

       *

       name =     RTCD
       label =
       record = 2
       column = 22
       width =   1
       min =     1
       labels =
                   1 Returned after 1st mailing but before postcard
                   2 Returned after postcard but before 2nd mailing
                   3 Returned after 2nd mailing


       text =
               Questionnaire Return Identification Code


       *

       name =     SMPL
       label =
       record = 2
       column = 23
       width =   1
       min =     1
       labels =
                   1 Police Information Officer
                   2 Newspaper Manager
                   3 Newspaper Reporter
                   4 TV Manager
                   5 TV Reporter


       text =
               Sub-sample Identification Code


       *

       name =     MSA
       label =
       record = 2
       column = 24
       width =   4
       min =     0
       labels =
                   0000 Code
                   9999 Code


       text =
               MSA CODE


       *

       name =     DCOD
       label =
       record = 2
       column = 28
       width =   4
       min =     0
       labels =
                   0001 Code
```

9999 Code

text =

Department Code